HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XXXIV OCTOBER, 1941 NUMBER 4

CODEX AND ROLL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

C. C. McCOWN
PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

DURING the last twenty or thirty years evidence has been rapidly accumulating to prove that the codex was in general use for books at a much earlier time than was formerly supposed. The definite testimony of Martial and others on the subject could be misinterpreted, discounted, or overlooked so long as there was no clear corroborating archaeological evidence. Papyrus and the roll had taken firm hold upon the classicistic imaginations of modern students of ancient literatures, especially after the nineteenth-century discoveries of papyri in Egypt, and no one dreamed that the New Testament documents could have been written originally on anything but papyrus sheets and papyrus rolls.

A THE ORIGIN OF THE CODEX

I THE ROLL IN ANTIQUITY

To the superficial eye the evidence for the roll was complete and ancient practice clear. The vast majority of the documents found in Egypt are on sheets or rolls of papyrus. In pre-Christian times and down to the end of the third century, the codex, or leaf book, and parchment or vellum rarely appeared among the papyri found in Egypt. The art of imperial Rome showed the roll everywhere in use by people of every kind.[1]

So strong, until recently, was the classicistic tradition, even among modern scholars, that the roll dominated the scene. Although it was an accepted fact that the New Testament text had been handed down in codices of the fourth century and that very little of it was otherwise known, yet it was not until the

[1] See Theodor Birt, Die Buchrolle in der Kunst (Leipzig, 1907).

end of the third century, so Caspar René Gregory put the accepted view in 1907, that the desire of Christians to have their sacred literature, especially the proof texts of the Old Testament, in easily accessible form led them to adopt the leaf book, the codex, for their Scriptures, both the Greek Old Testament and the New Testament. Indeed Gregory ascribed the introduction, if not the invention, of the leaf book to Christians and believed that Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were among the first leaf books to have been made.[2] He admitted, indeed, that "a new papyrus may tomorrow show that the change came earlier." Many new papyri have more than justified his proviso. By 1912 Sir Edward Maunde Thompson was ready to push the use of the codex, and not by Christians only, back into the "classical period at Rome," into "the earliest centuries of our era." [3] By 1921 Wilhelm Schubart, one of the foremost German papyrologists, was ready to argue that Christian literature from the beginning was in codex form.[4] He admitted there was lack of absolute proof, and that is still true. But later discoveries have gone far to confirm his position. How far, it is one object of this paper to indicate.

II Recent Discussions and New Conclusions

The evidence for the early use of the codex has been most completely assembled by Professor Henry A. Sanders of the University of Michigan for his presidential address given before the American Philological Association in 1937 and published in the following year.[5]

The subject had already been discussed not only by Theodor Birt, Karl Dziatzko, and Wilhelm Schubart,[6] but also by Sir

[2] Canon and Text of the New Testament (New York: Scribner, 1907), 322 f.

[3] Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), 28 ff., 51 ff.

[4] Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern, 2d ed. (Berlin and Leipzig: Vereinigung wissenschaftlicher Verleger, 1921), 119–23.

[5] 'Beginnings of the Modern Book,' Michigan Alumnus Quarterly Review, 44 (February, 1938), 95–111.

[6] Birt, Das Antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältnis zur Litteratur (Berlin, 1882), 46–126, esp. 105–26; 'Abriss des antiken Buchwesens,' in Müller's Handbuch der klass. Altertumswiss., I, 3, 3d ed. (1913), 245–376; Dziatzko, Untersuchungen über ausgewählte Kapitel des antiken Buchwesens (Leipzig, 1900); and in Pauly-Wissowa, art.

Frederic Kenyon in several connections,[7] by H. Idris Bell,[8] and by Professor James Westfall Thompson.[9] In his recent volume, Christianity Goes to Press, Professor E. J. Goodspeed has put the case for a comparatively early use of the codex with his usual charm and vigor.[10] Sanders, Schubart, Bell (doubtful), and others have reached more radical conclusions than have been commonly accepted. Independently Hugo Ibscher, as an expert on the preparation and preservation of papyrus rolls and other ancient materials, has reached the same radical conclusions,[11] and C. H. Roberts of the John Rylands Library has allied himself with this view.[12] Since the voluminous and complicated data, derived in part from literary allusions of a doubtful character, have been assembled by Sanders, there is no need to repeat them here *in extenso*. This paper attempts only to present and appraise the more significant pieces of evidence, particularly that from the archaeological side, and then to call attention to certain revolutionary results.

III The Use of Parchment and the Codex

There are many points still obscure regarding the origin of the codex and the introduction of parchment. Professor Sanders argues at great length that the introduction of the parchment codex for literary purposes certainly took place in the reign of

---

'Buchhandel,' 3 (1899), 983 f.; Schubart, Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern, 2d ed. (Berlin and Leipzig, 1921). See the important refs. in von Dobschütz-Nestle, Einführung in das griechische Neue Testament, 4th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1923), 32 f.

[7] Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932), esp. 86–119, with useful collection of source materials, 120–33; Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1939), 12 f.; The Text of the Greek Bible (London: Duckworth, 1937), 9–23. See now his The Bible and Archaeology (New York and London: Harper, 1940).

[8] Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyri, Inaugural Lecture (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1937), 25 f.

[9] Ancient Libraries (Berkeley: University of Calif. Press, 1940), 51–68. His conclusions were actually set down, as the author tells me, some years ago.

[10] (New York: Macmillan, 1940), 67–78. His theories will be discussed later. For visual orientation see W. H. P. Hatch, The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), 7 f., 12; and its plates.

[11] Art. 'Der Kodex,' in Buch und Schrift 10 (1937), 3–15.

[12] JTS, 40 (1939), 253–57; cf. also p. 272.

Augustus, perhaps even as early as Cicero's time.[13] It is quite generally agreed that the codex of wooden waxed tablets must have been known before Cicero in Rome and Greece and probably it was even centuries earlier. It cannot be denied that Martial, about 84 A.D., referred to the use of the parchment codex for literary works and greeted it as a vast improvement over the roll.[14] There is every reason to suppose that the *membranae* to which Catullus and other writers of the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. refer were parchment codices and, if so, their use is proved for note books, account books, memoranda, first drafts of literary works, and other writings not intended for the public.[15] The stoutest opponents of the "early" use of the parchment codex usually admit all of this.[16] They only insist that the codex was not in common use for literary works in the first century A.D., except in a most exceptional way, to which, they allege, Martial bears witness.

Now it must be admitted that, before Martial's time, no expression can be discovered which is not capable of a double interpretation as regards the rivalry of the roll and the codex. Not all of Professor Sanders' arguments from the literary sources are of equal weight, as he would doubtless admit.[17] Yet he is probably correct in his conclusions, although the case cannot be regarded as absolutely closed. However, the archaeological evidence, which is rarely considered, certainly has very great weight. Moreover it is of such a nature as to render the literary evidence, insofar as Christian writings are concerned, of minor value. It therefore deserves discussion in detail.

IV Archaeological Evidence

The archaeological evidence fully confirms the conclusions which are based upon the more tenuous literary evidence. It must be granted that no first-century codex is yet known. But none could be preserved in the Italian or Greek climate. In

[13] Op. cit. (above, note 5), 96–106.

[14] For discussions see Birt, Das antike Buchwesen, 71–87; Abriss, 345–54; Schubart, Das Buch, 114 f.; Kenyon, Books and Readers, 91–95, 124–33; Roberts, JTS, 40, 255 f.

[15] All this is fully discussed in the books mentioned in notes 5–9, and 14.

[16] Birt, Abriss, 344 ff.; Kenyon, Books and Readers, 90 ff.

[17] Cf. Roberts, JTS, 40 (1939), 256 f., and note 4.

Egypt, long usage, the immemorial custom of writing on papyrus, and the evil effects of Egypt's alternation of dampness and aridity upon leather would render the introduction of parchment and of vellum a slow and tardy process, in which the codex would share because at first associated with leather. On the supposition that the parchment codex was introduced by the "barbarian Romans" in the first century B.C. or A.D. for business purposes, what has been actually discovered in Egypt indicates a rather rapid dissemination of the new custom.

The first thing to be noted is that there are leaves from codices, both Christian and pagan, among the discovered literary papyri of the second century A.D. Some of them are dated on palaeographic grounds to the first half of the century. In view of the conditions just mentioned which militated against the use of the codex in Egypt, it is quite legitimate to assume that the codex of parchment or papyrus must have been known in Rome before any appeared in Egypt. The discovered documents enhance the plausibility of this assumption.

Enumerations of the rolls and codices of literary works discovered in Egypt have been made by Oldfather, Kenyon, and Sanders. All of them suffer under the frequent difficulty of determining whether a fragment is from a roll or a codex. However, they all agree that the papyrus roll held the field for literary works down into the third century.

According to Sir Frederic Kenyon's census of pagan literary finds at Oxyrhynchus, no codex appeared until after 200 A.D. To the third century belong 100 rolls and 6 codices. In the fourth, pagan literature suffered a tremendous drop. There were 6 rolls and 8 codices, 3 of papyrus and 5 of vellum. In the fifth century, there were 4 rolls against 17 papyrus and 4 vellum codices. That is, the percentage of codices is 5.6 in the third century, 57 in the fourth, and 85 in the fifth.[18]

[18] Books and Readers, 95 f. Egyptian preference for papyrus instead of parchment is emphasized by a discovery made about 1933 of fourteen well-preserved Aramaic documents on leather, written by Arsâma, the Persian viceroy in Egypt who appears in the Elephantine papyri, and by other Persian officials. See Franz Rosenthal, Die aramaitische Forschung seit Theodor Nöldeke's Veröffentlichung (Leiden, 1939), pp. 37 f. I owe this reference to the kindness of Dr. Rosenthal through the intermediation of Dr. W. F. Albright.

In 1922 Professor Charles Henry Oldfather counted all the then-known literary works that had been found in Egypt. His inventory showed that, of 304 literary manuscripts dated in the third century, 275 were papyrus rolls, 26 papyrus codices, and 3 vellum codices. In the fourth century, out of 83 manuscripts, 34 were papyrus codices, and 10 vellum codices. In the fifth century, out of 78, 55 were codices, 43 of papyrus and 12 of vellum. That is to say, the proportion of codices in the third century was slightly less than 10 per cent; in the fourth century codices represented 53 per cent of the total, in the fifth century 70 per cent. By the seventh century the roll had all but disappeared.[19]

When the first two enumerations were made and when most of the documents were dated, it could hardly be admitted that codices might have appeared in the second century except as freaks. Some manuscripts were placed in the third century just because they were codices and not rolls. It is entirely probable that the dating of several fragments still requires revision. However, the general trend is clear even in these enumerations, and the rapidity with which the codex displaced the roll would only be emphasized by any revision which might now be undertaken.

It is particularly worthy of note that nothing written on the backs of discarded rolls can count as evidence of preference for rolls. Two Christian documents of this sort deserve special mention because they are sometimes misused. The second group of Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus, found in 1903, was written on a roll, but it was the back of a survey list. The early fourth-century Epistle to the Hebrews, which was written on the back of an epitome of Livy, suffers under the same disability. They only prove that two Christians were desirous enough of having copies of pieces of Christian literature to copy them out for themselves on some available "scratch paper." [20]

The latest enumeration, that by Professor Sanders, avoids the mistakes of the earlier two, without, however, undertaking a

[19] University of Wisconsin Studies, 9 (Madison, 1923); cited by Kenyon, op. cit., 111.

[20] See George Milligan, The New Testament Documents (London: Macmillan, 1913), 266 f., 252; OxP 654, 657, 668 (pl. 3).

complete revision of dates. Of pagan literary works from Egypt Professor Sanders knows of two papyrus and two vellum codices of the second century. One of the latter is a page from the Cretans of Euripides now in Berlin; the other, two pages of Demosthenes' De Corona in the British Museum. In the third century he counts 16 codices of papyrus and 4 of vellum as against 291 papyrus rolls. In the fourth century, he lists only 26 papyrus roll fragments as against 32 codices of papyrus and 17 of parchment. In the fifth century, there are only 9 roll fragments compared with 47 codices of papyrus and 19 of parchment. In the sixth and seventh centuries the roll practically disappears. That is, codices are 6 per cent in the third century, 65 per cent in the fourth, and 89 per cent in the fifth century.[21]

The somewhat startling difference between the enumerations of Professor Oldfather and Professor Sanders is due in part to recent discoveries, in part (especially in the fourth century) to differences of classification. Evidently, however, the situation at Oxyrhynchus was not a special one, for the percentages recovered from Sir Frederic Kenyon's enumeration run much the same as elsewhere. In spite of differences, the three enumerations agree as to the serious drop in pagan literature in the fourth century, when Christianity came into power, as to the rapid rise of the codex in favor, and as to the relatively slow progress of vellum.

Convenience of reference, probably more than cheapness, led to the choice of codices for several books of magic. Durability was not the point, for most of those found were made of papyrus. The fact that twice as much material was made available on the same amount of papyrus might have been considered, especially in the "Great Paris Magic Papyrus." Probably, however, the chief consideration was the fact that magic books were not prepared for the elite book trade, but for business use, and many magicians, like Christians, belonged to the lower classes of society. For them the customs of the snobbish groups who bought and read books had no force. The majority of the collections of magical lore that have been published (9 out of 14 that seem to be worth counting) are rolls.

[21] Op. cit. (above n. 5), 107.

But the largest collections are in codices with the exception of two opisthographs.[22]

There is sufficient evidence from Dura-Europos to show that the roll continued to have complete predominance and that papyrus outdid parchment in a ratio of about five to two. But that is to be expected, since the documents for the most part antedate the middle of the third century. The evidence, therefore, is not strong and, moreover, it is discounted by the probable conservatism of a military and commercial city on the actual outskirts of the Empire. The high proportion of parchment pieces, as compared with Egypt is noticeable, and suggests that similar situations would have existed elsewhere in the Empire outside of Egypt.

B EARLY NEW TESTAMENT CODICES

V Enumeration of Christian Documents

Recent discoveries of Christian documents, both canonical and apocryphal Scriptures and theological works, complete this picture and furnish much food for thought. In 1926 Sir Frederic Kenyon enumerated from Oxyrhynchus 17 Christian documents of the third century, 7 in rolls, 8 in codices of papyrus, and 2 on vellum. In the fourth century, against 14 pagan manuscripts, there were 36 Christian. Two of the latter were rolls, neither of which count as evidence on Christian publishing, for one is a school-boy exercise, the other the copy of Hebrews just mentioned. There were 21 papyrus and 13 vellum codices. In the fifth century there were still 4 Christian rolls, but there were only 7 papyrus codices against 10 on vellum.[23]

Professor Sanders' inventory of all Christian documents found in Egypt naturally gives a truer picture of Christian practice throughout that land. He finds one doubtful roll and 4 papyrus codices in the second century; 9 rolls, 2 of them discounted, against 35 codices of papyrus and 3 of vellum in the third century; 6 rolls, 4 of them school exercises copied on the

[22] Karl Preisendanz, Papyri graecae magicae, 2 vols. (Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner 1928, 1931).

[23] Books and Readers, 95 f.

verso of used rolls, against 42 papyrus and 22 parchment codices in the fourth century. In the fifth and sixth centuries there are but 6 fragments with verso blank and only one of these can be counted as a normal roll. But there are 10 fragments of papyrus codices and 16 of parchment in the fifth century, with respectively 12 and 13 in the sixth century.[24] Significant confirmation of the Christian preference for vellum codices may be seen in a line from a fifth or sixth-century papyrus containing an inventory of the books in the library of an Egyptian village church: "21 parchment books, 3 of papyrus."[25] Much more startling is the collection of eleven papyrus codices, probably from some fourth-century monastery library, which have become connected with the name of A. Chester Beatty and will be discussed below.

The papyri, some containing pagan literature, some Christian, which were discovered in 1936 by the Colt Expedition at 'Aujā el-Ḥafîr in southern Palestine, the first of any significance to be found in that land, confirm the conclusions that have been based upon Egyptian discoveries. Professor Kraemer of the College of the City of New York, who has been charged with the supervision of their publication, writes me that all of the literary and religious documents are codices and all were constructed of quires of single sheets of two leaves each.[26] Thus, so far as this evidence goes, in the sixth and seventh centuries, in which all of the business documents are dated, Palestine knew only the codex and only papyrus for their manufacture.

It is a remarkable fact that pagan literature, which seemed on the way to complete extinction in the fourth century, revived slightly in the fifth, perhaps because the now conquering hosts of Christianity had begun to feel less fear and sensitiveness over pagan influences and were rising in the social scale. At the same time, particularly at Oxyrhynchus, there was a revival of the use of the roll in Christian circles. The more inclusive enumeration of Professor Sanders shows a slight tendency

[24] Op. cit., 106 f. Bell, op. cit. (above, note 8), 25, knows of no second-century roll.

[25] B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, New Classical Fragments (Oxford, 1897), 111, l. 27: *βιβλία δερμάτι(να) κα', δμοί(ως) χαρτία γ'*.

[26] Letter of April 25, 1940.

in the same direction. No doubt this is due to the rise of Christianity in the scale of culture. However, in the sixth century the roll had become negligible. It was no longer used except in certain formal documents, such as bishops' encyclicals, much as it is used even today in diplomas and documents for formal presentation. On the whole, viewing the archaeological evidence for the six centuries, it must be agreed that the Christians showed no evidence of being deeply influenced either by the use of the roll in the synagogue or by the dominance of the roll during the first three centuries as the vehicle of pagan literature. They were not affected by current fashion, but from the beginning preferred the codex.

VI The Earliest Christian Documents

It is not at all surprising, therefore, that the fourth century produced the great vellum manuscripts upon which the modern critical texts of the New Testament depend, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, to be followed by Ephraemi Rescriptus, the Freer, or Washington, Gospels, the Bezan codex, and Alexandrinus. It is impossible to suppose that these codices, nearly all of them magnificent specimens of the bookmaker's art, were without predecessors. The finest of them disclose their inheritance from the roll in their narrow columns, their subscribed as well as superscribed titles, their chirography, and other details, but, in book form, they are too perfect to be a recent invention.

The extremely careful study of Codex Sinaiticus which its presence in England and the process of binding it made possible resulted in the significant observation that "the technique of the vellum codex, even at this early stage of its career, (was) in so high a state of development that down to the present day no radical changes or improvements have been evolved." [27] A painstaking investigation of all the arguments leads also to the conclusion that the manuscript was copied from dictation. That means that a very considerable number of copyists must have been at work. In other words, not only the technique of making codices, but also the trade in them must have been highly de-

[27] H. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus (London: British Museum, 1938), 70.

veloped before 360 A.D., the latest date at which the manufacture of this copy can be placed.[28]

When Constantine ordered fifty copies of the Scriptures prepared for the churches of his new capital,[29] there must have been precedents enough for the production of such codices, and the use of the codex in the Christian churches for liturgical purposes must have been already long established. It is perhaps worth noting that the only one of the preserved ancient codices just mentioned which has an ancient binding, the Freer Gospels, has pictures of its authors on its binding, just as Martial's copy of Virgil had the author's *vultus* on its first *tabella*. The binding of the Freer Gospels is not original, but it may represent its predecessors, which, in this as in other particulars, were imitating ancient Roman codices.

That there were such precedents in the third century had been inferred. It is now abundantly established, not only by the third-century codices already enumerated, but also by more or less fragmentary manuscripts, recently found, which fall before 200 A.D. Over fifty papyrus fragments bearing New Testament texts are now listed. Nearly all of them are from codices, perhaps two only from rolls. Some eight of them were probably written in the third century and four in the second, against a single doubtful roll from that century.

The widely heralded discoveries of the Egerton (British Museum) apocryphal Gospel, of the Chester Beatty and Michigan papyri, and of the Rylands John throw new light on the problem of the New Testament text and also upon the question as to the manner in which the New Testament books were being collected and transmitted in the second and third centuries. A summary of their outstanding features will make their significance more evident.

The very considerable Christian library which was acquired about 1930 by Mr. A. Chester Beatty, an American residing in London, and by the University of Michigan, is described by Sir Frederic Kenyon as "the most remarkable discovery of biblical manuscripts since Tischendorf's finding of the Codex Sinaiti-

[28] Milne and Skeat, op. cit., 51–59, 64.

[29] Eusebius, Vit. Constant., iv. 36: *πεντήκοντα σωμάτια ἐν διφθέραις.*

cus." [30] They are likewise the most significant discovery of books in codex form ever made, for they are the earliest codices of which any considerable portions have been preserved. Chester Beatty Papyrus I consists of thirty leaves of a papyrus codex which originally had 220 leaves and contained the four Gospels and the Book of Acts probably in the "western" order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, Acts. It is to be dated in the early third century. Still earlier, written about 200 A.D. according to Ulrich Wilcken, is Papyrus II, which still has eighty-six nearly perfect leaves, out of a computed total of 104, of a codex of the writings of Paul. It is the oldest extant manuscript of any considerable portion of the New Testament.[31] That Hebrews comes second, after Romans, and that the Pastorals may have been wanting are interesting items for the history of the Canon. Papyrus III, also of the third century, seems to have been a codex of Revelation alone. Another third-century fragment of a papyrus codex is a page of Acts, published by Vitelli in 1932.

Perhaps most astonishing and most significant of all is the little fragment of the Gospel of John which turned up at the John Rylands Library in Manchester in 1935. It measures only $2\frac{1}{2}$ by $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches and contains portions of only five verses, but its minute size hardly detracts from its importance.[32] The papyrological experts agree that it is to be dated in the first half of the second century. A hundred years ago Ferdinand Christian Baur and his influential Tübingen school agreed that the Fourth Gospel could not have been written before 170 A.D. Here is a fragment of a papyrus codex of the Gospel which was copied out a generation earlier than Baur's assumed date of its composition, and which goes far to confirm the traditional date of that Gospel at the close of the first century or the beginning of the second. This oldest existing manuscript of any

[30] Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, 4th ed. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1939), 64.

[31] Henry A. Sanders, A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul (Univ. of Michigan Stud., Humanistic Series, 38), Ann Arbor, 1935.

[32] C. H. Roberts, An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel (Manchester: University Press, 1935); Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 20 (Manchester, 1936), 1–9, 45–55.

portion of the New Testament is from a papyrus codex, not from a roll. It is not unique in such a sense as to cast any doubt upon the date assigned. The Chester Beatty papyri include one (VI) consisting of 28 leaves, out of a computed 50, of a codex of Numbers and Deuteronomy which cannot be later than 150 A.D. At present it holds the palm as the oldest leaf book of which more than a page or two is preserved. There are also small portions of two leaves of a codex of Jeremiah which belongs at the end of the second century, thirty leaves of an Isaiah codex, and fifty of a codex that contained Ezekiel, Daniel, and Esther, both dating in the first half of the third century. These serve as sufficient evidence to prove that the early Christians had the Old Testament as well as the New in codex form. The Egerton apocryphal Gospel, recently published by H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat,[33] has been discussed chiefly because of its importance for the understanding of early Christian attempts to record the life of Jesus. But it is of especial significance for a study of the practice of early Christians in the matter of publishing. Dating in the middle of the second century, it stands as another bit of unequivocal evidence of their preference for the codex. The first discovered bit of Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus and the Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas, recently edited by Campbell Bonner,[34] both of the third century, among others, show the steady continuance of that preference.

Thus there is abundant ocular evidence for the wide use of the codex by Christians for their Scriptures and other writings in the second century, even in the first half of it, before the latest New Testament books, such as Second Peter, were written. There is no evidence for any but the slightest use of the roll. There might be doubt if this evidence were from mere scraps of papyrus. But the Chester Beatty and University of Michigan documents consist of large numbers of pages, many of them completely preserved. The palaeographic judgments which date the papyri come from English, American, and German

[33] Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Christian Papyri (London: British Museum, 1935); Bulletin John Rylands Library, 20, 56–92.

[34] University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, 22, Ann Arbor, 1934.

experts who now have a vast material of dated papyri with which to compare these documents.

VII Bibliological Details

The peculiarities of these early codices as products of the bookmaker's art are interesting and, as will later appear, significant. Dr. Hugo Ibscher, conservator of papyri in the Staatsbibliothek at Berlin, who, as the foremost expert, has prepared many rolls and codices for the perusal of philologians, discovered that the earliest codices were made from blank rolls of papyrus, for, in numerous instances, he could detect the almost invisible joints between the papyrus sheets which had been glued together to form the rolls. Most codices up to the end of the third century were made up of a single quire, the double sheets being folded together in the center and laid one above another.[35] Another method, that of Chester Beatty Papyrus I (the Gospels and Acts), was to make each sheet a quire, of two leaves, or four pages. Often care was taken to place the sides with horizontal fibers facing each other, so that the pages facing together would present a similar appearance, as later in parchment codices the hair sides of the leaves came together.[36]

A noteworthy and undesirable result of making a codex of a thick single quire was that the center pages were much narrower than the outer ones when the margins were trimmed, or, if they were not trimmed, the central pages protruded like a wedge when the book was closed. Ibscher calculates that, in the Paul codex, which had but 52 sheets, the difference between the outer and inner sheets was 10 centimeters, almost 4 inches. Therefore, while the width of the writing on the outside pages was 13 centimeters (over 5 in.), that on the center pages was only 8–9 centimeters ($3\frac{1}{8}$–$3\frac{1}{2}$ in.). The maker of the codex (probably the scribe himself) had allowed for this eventuality by cutting the sheets progressively narrower as he neared the center, so that by the final trimming of the edges of the volume a strip about 15 millimeters ($\frac{5}{8}$ in.) wide was cut from all of the

[35] Buch und Schrift 10 (1937), 11 f.

[36] For an exception see the Michigan Shepherd of Hermas (above, note 34), pp. 8, 12.

sheets.[37] A similar grading of the width of the pages has been discovered in the J. Pierpont Morgan Iliad and the very early Coptic Gospel of John.[38] In one of these early codices Ibscher believed it possible to discover that the six outer leaves were glued together to make a cover which was further strengthened by a leather cover.[39]

Professor Campbell Bonner, on the other hand, thinks the disadvantages of the single-quire codex have been exaggerated. Papyrus sheets when new, as he believes, might have been soft and pliable, like Chinese or Japanese paper. Yet, if heavy, a large, single-quire book would not lie closed. Even if thin, it would bulge near the fold, and the central leaves would project like a wedge. This defect and the tedious process necessary to remedy it may have been the chief reasons for the abandonment of this kind of codex.[40]

Of equal interest, by way of contrast and illustrating the progress of the bookmaker's art, is the form of the seven volumes of Mani's works which came to light at about the same time as the Beatty biblical manuscripts.[41] A century or less after Mani's crucifixion for his faith in 275 A.D., these seven luxury volumes of a Coptic translation of his works were prepared for some Egyptian disciple. The sheets were not cut from a papyrus roll prepared for the trade, but were specially manufactured to size and with the utmost care as to quality. The quires were all of six sheets, or double leaves, each; the quires, as well as the pages, were numbered in order; and they were sewed together, probably with the chain stitch. The single column of writing on each page measured 100–110 by 165–175 millimeters ($3\frac{7}{8}$–$4\frac{2}{8}$ by $6\frac{1}{2}$–$6\frac{7}{8}$ in.) and the pages 175 by 270 millimeters (ca. $6\frac{7}{8}$ by $10\frac{5}{8}$ in.). With the more skillful management

[37] Op. cit., 12. See also W. Schubart, Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern, 126–29; Einführung in die Papyruskunde (Berlin, 1918), 55 f.

[38] See refs. in Campbell Bonner, op. cit. (above, note 34), p. 11, note 2.

[39] Op. cit. (above, note 35), 13. He does not give the nature of his evidence nor name the codex.

[40] Op. cit., 10 f.

[41] Ibscher, op. cit., 13 ff.; H. J. Polotsky, art., 'Manichäismus,' Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl. 6 (1934), 240–71, esp. 241: 61–65; Carl Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky, Ein Manifund in Ägypten, Sitzungberichte preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse (1933), I.

of the quires, one volume could run to 500 pages. The bindings had been torn off in antiquity, but there is every likelihood that these smaller volumes would have compared very favorably in appearance with the more imposing tomes which the Christian church was producing for its public worship. Certainly the handwriting is less "Coptic" and more beautiful than that of the almost contemporary Washington Gospels, even if it is not quite so clear and regular as that of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.

VIII General Conclusions

If, now, in Egypt, where the roll was so widely used in the second and third centuries for business as well as literary documents, the codex appears to be the favorite form of book among the early Christians, there can be no reason to suspect them of imitating any local fashion. On the contrary they must have been reproducing a new invention, doubtless imported from abroad. What could have been its source? In the present state of our knowledge, Italy and the use of the codex there can be the only answer. There is no available evidence as to Palestine, Asia Minor, and Greece. Among business people in the latter two regions the influence of Rome might be expected to be stronger than that of Egypt, and the use of the codex of *membranae* for accounts and other nonliterary purposes would be as common as in Rome. Some time in the first century Paul or a Paulinist could refer to *membranai* left in Troas.[42] From whatever directions Christianity came to Egypt, it must have come chiefly from a place where the codex was already well established in Christian usage, or it could not have made its way against Egyptian immemorial custom. It is natural, but not necessary, to assume that Italy is the source.

The social and economic status of the early Christians, as it has usually been pictured, favors the idea that they would have used the codex and explains their preference for it. The leaders among them must have been fairly literate, but they would have been far from literary. Even Paul was not a littérateur. Coming as they did from small commercial and industrial folk, they would have been fully accustomed to the use of the

[42] 2 Tim. 4. 13.

wooden or parchment codex for business purposes. Even women among them, like the wife of Terentius Neo of Pompeii, the charming young woman with the gold hair net from Herculaneum, and several more whose portraits appear on Pompeian walls and Egyptian mummy coverings, must have known the use of the stylus and codex of waxed tablets, and of the reed pen and *pugillares membranae*, for the keeping of household accounts. What more natural than that they should copy their Old Testament Scriptures and the writings of their new leaders into codices?

Custom and familiarity seem to me the strongest argument for assuming that the early Christians used codices from the first. Another argument that has frequently been used to explain their break with current literary custom is the convenience of the codex for the finding of proof texts in the Old Testament writings. The argument is perfectly sound. One has but to imagine the repeated unwindings and rewindings of a roll of the prophets or the Pentateuch by a Christian in search of a text to confound a Jewish opponent or convert a Gentile inquirer to see the advantage of the leaf book over the roll. The traveling missionary or evangelist would find in the codex all of the advantages which Martial praises. The early use of the codex by lawyers and magicians are cases in which similar needs would lead to similar practices.

The argument that parchment was cheaper is disputed. Yet it is usually maintained that all of the parchment codices for which Martial prepared his epigrams are inexpensive gifts, whereas the rich Suffenus and Pliny the Elder could afford to use papyrus for their notes.[43] In Diocletian's price-fixing edict parchment is more costly, but, it is said, this reflects the change in custom which had made parchment the preferred material. There seems to be no evidence which will settle the question. The durability of parchment and possibilities of re-use, which must have greatly exceeded those of papyrus, would commend it to business men as a medium for setting down temporary

[43] B. L. Ullman in the Classical Journal 29, pp. 57–60, reviewing Kenyon's Books and Readers, does not agree that parchment was regarded as inferior in the early Empire.

records and notes, and to authors for first drafts. The fact that the codex allowed the use of both sides of the writing material certainly would operate to make it, whatever its market price, twice as valuable as the same length of papyrus in a roll. In any case it had great advantages, in durability, smaller size, and convenience for purposes of reference.

One almost universal assumption in earlier discussions of the subject has been that Christians would follow literary tradition in preserving their sacred writings as later they adopted current artistic conventions. Another is that the works of art which show them holding rolls in their hands represent actual practice.[44] Both assumptions are false. Painting and sculpture were quite different matters from writing. The Christians would have to use for the painting of their catacombs and the carving of their sarcophagi pagan or converted artists who had been trained in certain conventions. The poorer the artist — it needs no argument to prove that those employed were poor — the greater the likelihood that he would follow convention. What has not been used in art is inartistic until some original genius uses it. Christian artists were not geniuses, if one may judge from results. The earliest preserved illustrated manuscripts prove that, in depicting the use of the codex, even pagan artists lagged behind usage as revealed by the codices found in Egypt. The appearance of the roll, therefore, on Christian monuments proves nothing as to actual practice.

Writing was a very different matter from painting and sculpture. It is not likely that early Christian books were made by professional scribes or published through the book trade. Innumerable people in the first and second centuries who were not trained *librarii* knew how to write. As Kenyon says, "In Graeco-Roman Egypt (the same would have been true in Ephesus, Corinth, Antioch, and Rome) books might be produced anywhere by anybody."[45] He uses Aristotle's Constitution of Athens as an example. It may well serve to suggest what early Christians would have done anywhere in the Roman Empire. Sometime in the first century Aristotle's work was

[44] They seem to be constantly in Sir Frederic Kenyon's mind in his allusions to the subject.

[45] Books and Readers, 68.

copied on the back of a roll of farm accounts by four different hands, two of them people of some education, perhaps the persons who were interested in having the document for study, and two of them "very imperfectly educated underlings," [46] perhaps slaves or even less educated members of the family. Numerous examples of literary works copied by people with quite untrained hands are known from Egypt. The practice continued, along beside the publication of books in trade channels, until printing came. As a young man in Rome, Jerome, "with the greatest application and labor got together a library for himself" of *codices saeculares*.[47] Doubtless he copied them himself.

One may be almost certain that the New Testament books were first reproduced in this way. The early Christians never dreamed of producing literature. Even the Old Testament was anything but literature to them; it was a divine revelation and an arsenal of messianic proof texts. Moreover they were for the most part poor people, and they were also practical business folk. Martial proves that, at the time when the first Christian literature was being produced, the parchment codex was already being used for epitomes and cheap, school-book editions of classical works. He wrote his epigrams on the subject, not "at the end of the first century," but in 84 or 85 A.D., less than a quarter of a century after Paul's death, only some fifteen years after Mark was written. The parchment codex would have been long in use below the literary surface before Martial calls attention to it. There is, then, every reason why the Christians should have composed and copied their earliest books *in membranis*. Not the roll but the codex would be the natural repository for any documents they wished to produce or preserve.

To the person, then, who is interested in the relation of Christian literature to the codex, it is quite unnecessary to prove that pagan literary works were usually copied into codices in the first century. It is quite possible to agree with Kenyon that Martial's epigrams celebrate a new departure, an exceptional

[46] Ibid., 61, 69.

[47] Epist. 22. 30 Vall.

procedure. Neither fact (they probably are facts) affects the argument as to early Christian books, because they were not regarded as literature and were not put on the market.

C SPECIFIC CONCLUSIONS

IX As to Individual Books

The evidence that has been adduced and the general conclusions that have been drawn have a great deal to add to the traditional and even the critical, scholarly conception of the beginnings of the New Testament. It alters decidedly the accounts that can legitimately be drawn up regarding the composition of the Gospels, the preservation and spread of the New Testament books, the collection of these books and their canonization, and the preservation of the text.

As to the Gospels, the wide-spread literacy of Egypt in the first century suggests caution as to the extension of the period of unwritten, purely oral tradition. However, that does not greatly affect the conclusions of form criticism. These may be properly attacked on other grounds, but not on the basis of current custom as to writing, for the earliest written collections of anecdotes and sayings may be assumed to have been most informal. They would have followed the laws of folk tradition and would have been repeated, whether orally or in writing, by people who were entirely nonliterary and utterly without historical consciousness. Why is it not permissible to think of numerous *pugillares membranae*, even of housewives' *triptycha*, as filled with anecdotes collected here and there and recopied by one person or another in whole or in part? Each writer would feel quite free to modify, abridge, and supplement the records in conformity with other oral or written accounts that had come to notice or in the interest of vividness, brevity, missionary effectiveness, ethical need, and religious faith.[48] Unless some still more astonishing discovery may present to the world earlier and more primitive materials than the Egerton Gospel and the Oxyrhynchus Sayings and Gospels, no more precise conclusions

[48] The triple variants of the story of Paul's conversion in Acts are suggestive of the freedom possible even to the same writer in different contexts.

are possible, and hypotheses based on data now known are too uncertain to be of value. However the use which Matthew and Luke have made of Mark fully illustrates this early freedom and establishes the broad but hazy outlines of the picture that has just been drawn.

As to the forms in which the Gospels themselves first appeared, certain conclusions seem justified. The whole argument applies *a fortiori* to Mark. Since, for some generations before the Christians appeared in Rome, the parchment codex was well known there as a *memorialis libellus*, the proper medium in which to write *commentarii* and first drafts of works of all kinds, it is not merely "a tenable hypothesis," as C. H. Roberts argues, but an almost certain one, that Mark, the Roman Gospel, the simplest and least literary of all, was written first in a codex, was copied by this Christian and that into other codices as they desired to have it, and rarely or never appeared in a roll. If, as Catullus and other Roman writers repeatedly intimate, the codex of *membranae* or *tabellae* was ordinarily used for first drafts of literary works; if, as Professor Sanders argues, Caesar used codices of *membranae* for his despatches to the Senate; if, as I have suggested, the early Christians, as nonliterary, business people, were familiar with their use in all kinds of practical affairs, there is every reason to suppose that Mark at Rome composed his Gospel in a parchment codex and that it was eventually copied and spread in that form among the Christians of the Mediterranean area.

A recent brief note by Sir Frederic Kenyon, written *à propos* the "lost ending" of Mark, argues still that the Gospel must originally have been written in a roll since "there would be no occasion for the employment of anything except the normal roll form for so short a work as Mark's Gospel.[49] The fallacy in the argument lies in the phrase, "the normal roll form." It was not merely size, convenience, and, possibly, low cost, but contrary custom which gave the codex advantage over the roll in Christian eyes. These considerations would have weighed heavily with the proletarian Christians of Rome. In a short article dissenting from Sir Frederic's position, Mr. C. H. Roberts

[49] JTS, 40 (1939), 56 f.

summarizes the arguments for the first-century use of the codex by Christians and suggests that it "may have acquired a kind of symbolic value for the Christians as (perhaps by contrast) the roll did for the Jews." [50]

The purpose of Sir Frederic's note was to explain the loss of the ending of Mark on the basis of the use of the roll. The latter end of the roll, he thinks, might have been exposed to special wear and tear by readers who carelessly failed to rewind it after reading — as users of films sometimes also forget. Not only so, but the presence of the title at the end of ancient works is said to prove that rolls were intended to be left with the last column exposed. Mr. Roberts replies that the title was not placed there alone, as in many medieval manuscripts, but also at the beginning as well as on the label, or *sillybos*. What was put at the end, actually an *explicit* rather than a title, was placed there because it was the safest and best protected end. Moreover, as Sir Frederic himself admits, in rolls actually discovered, the beginning has suffered dismemberment more often than the end.

While not impossible, a mechanical explanation of the truncation of Mark has always seemed to me difficult if the Gospel were in roll form. On the contrary it is quite natural if the little book were a codex. That the ending has been lost I cannot doubt, contrary to Mr. Roberts. Unlike him I believe that "bibliography," the history of the book, does make a real contribution to the solution of the problem. It does not prove indubitably that an account of the resurrection appearances originally closed the book and that it was lost rather than suppressed. But, by providing a plausible explanation of its disappearance, it adds a strong argument for the probability of its mechanical loss.

The "great omission" by which Luke jumps from Mark 6.44 to 8.26 may easily have been due to the loss of a leaf or two from the codex which Luke was using. In the Chester Beatty codex of the Gospels and Acts, the omission takes somewhat less than four pages out of a probable 30. If exactly four

[50] Op. cit., 253–57. In note 4, p. 256, Mr. Roberts presents well founded criticisms of certain conclusions of Birt and Sanders.

be allowed, a codex of 36 pages would include all of Mark without the missing ending. The text might begin on the verso of the first leaf, and Chapters 1.1 to 6.43 would cover pages 2–14, the omission pages 15–18, the remainder pages 19-36, which might be somewhat crowded. In the text of Nestle's 15th edition, Chapters 1.1–6.44 take 18 pages, the omission 6 pages, the remainder up to 16.8 takes 28 pages, a total of 52 pages. This would make 13 four-page sheets in the single-quire book. Various combinations are possible. It is next to impossible to explain Luke's omission by a mechanical loss unless Mark was in codex form.

Only a much more tentative conclusion is possible regarding the troublesome dislocations in the Gospel of John. Because it undoubtedly was written in the east, it may seem less likely to have been published in codex form. Yet the codex form is fully as likely, if not much more so, in Asia Minor and Syria than in Egypt. And if the Fourth Gospel is found in codex form in Egypt, perhaps long before 150 A.D., as several competent scholars now insist on the evidence of the Rylands leaf, it cannot be considered at all strange if it were originally published in that form. There is no evidence to prove that the codex was not as popular in nonliterary circles in Asia Minor as in Rome. But the question of publication is not important.

If the first draft of the Gospel were on *tabellae*, of either wood or parchment, the dislocation theory, so badly needed to explain the serious flaws in logical and geographical connection in portions of the Gospel, is rendered much more plausible. The chief objection to the theory of accidental disarrangement is the fact that breaks never, or rarely, occur within sentences, but rather between self-contained paragraphs. The displacements, therefore, may be laid to editorial ineptitude rather than accident. Long before there arose any discussion of the use by ancient writers of *tabellae* and *membranae* for first drafts of their compositions, various New Testament scholars had suggested that the Fourth Gospel was the re-editing of the memories and meditations of some gifted disciple of Jesus. If, now, the unordered notes in a *memorialis libellus* were edited and copied out by a group of secondary disciples, who appear in the "we" of chap-

ter 21, the disturbing dislocations are easily explained, and the attempt at rearrangement, as in Dr. James Moffatt's translation, is justified.

As to the Book of Acts and the Gospel of Luke, the conclusion must be different. If Luke-Acts, which clearly constitute a single work divided into two volumes, had been intended for publication in a codex, there was no need whatever for dividing them. In a moderate-sized hand either of the two would fill a roll of some 32 to 35 feet, which seems to be a size somewhat larger than the average. A book of Thucydides was about that length, but the books of Plato's Republic and Laws were about half that size and the books of the Iliad still shorter.[51] The dedication of the work to the "most excellent Theophilus," the character of the language, and especially the four verses of introduction indicate that this work, if no other in the New Testament, was intended for a public with some literary taste. There is every reason, then, for believing that it was published in rolls for a social stratum which would have looked upon the codex somewhat as readers of the Times and the Atlantic look upon tabloids and pulp magazines.

Concrete data upon which to base hypotheses regarding other New Testament books are wanting. Once the assumption is abandoned that the roll was the normal form for early Christian books, it must be agreed that either codex or roll is possible. Matthew is slightly shorter than Luke, exactly the length of the second book of Thucydides.[52] If it was composed in the eastern part of Syria, as Bacon believed,[53] the data from Dura might be thought to give preference to the roll. Size would not suggest that any other book of the New Testament was prepared for a codex. Outside of the Gospels and Acts none would make a roll twenty feet in length. Yet, if the codex was the preferred Christian form of book, any of them, except the three or four shortest, might have been given to the world in the codex form, for the exceedingly simple single-quire book, made up of sheets folded, laid one upon another, and sewed along the

[51] See Kenyon, Books and Readers, 62. Whether originally so divided or not, they now illustrate current practice.

[52] Loc. cit., note. [53] Studies in Matthew (New York: Holt, 1930), 18–23.

fold, would suit any size. If any one has a penchant for imagining mechanical explanations of difficulties, he might suggest that the lack of epistolary introduction in Hebrews is due to the loss of the first page, which had carried an address to the readers preparing them for the homily that followed.

Whether the reference to a roll in Revelation 5. 1 is a concession to artistic convention, an imitation of Ezekiel 2.9, or an indication of the writer's own use of the roll, it is impossible to say. Probably the last two. If one may judge from the expression, "roll up like a book" (6.14), *biblion* to this author meant roll. Revelation appears in the Chester Beatty papyri as a single codex, of the third century. On the one hand this serves to indicate that size was not significant in determining the choice of the codex in preference to the roll. On the other hand it underlines the isolation from which that peculiar book suffered. It may have been the favorite book of some and specially singled out for personal copying. Its appearance in a form which may be called a pocket codex, *Apocalypsis in pugillaribus membranis*, to paraphrase Martial's Epigram 184, in a fourth-century vellum manuscript (OxP 1080) is another example. It is to be remembered that the book stood by itself and, like some of the General Epistles, was slow to gain full status beside the other New Testament books. Indeed Acts, the General Epistles and the Apocalypse stand in much the same uncertain position as did the Kethubhim in the Old Testament Canon. It is the character of the book, its want of a secure classification into a closed group, that isolated it; and its failure to secure inclusion into a codex along with accepted books doubtless delayed its canonization.

X Collection and Canonization

In the collection of the various books into the conventional groups of Gospels and Epistles, Pauline and General, the codex played a decisive role. Sir Frederic Kenyon has called attention to the fact that collected editions of an author's works were impossible so long as the roll was the sole medium for preserving literature. Seven plays of Aeschylus or Sophocles have sur-

vived because they were the seven most popular. If the codex had been in use, others would have been copied along with the popular plays.[54]

That passage deserves especial attention because it suggests so much more than it says with regard to the preservation of the books of the New Testament. If the codex had been as fashionable in literary circles as it was among the Christians, probably very much more of ancient literature would have been preserved. If it had been used by the Jews, we might have very much earlier copies of the Hebrew Old Testament. It may be recalled that the oldest Hebrew manuscript known is a codex. Those seven plays each of Aeschylus and Sophocles have come down to us in codices, likewise Euripides' more numerous plays. Menander was discovered in a codex. Possibly their preservation was due to their "canonization" by inclusion in codices.

On Martial's evidence the codex came into use for books that were to be read, as distinguished from business records, diaries, and first drafts, just in time to make possible the collection of the fugitive writings of Paul and other early Christians into permanent form. Paul's letters, without Hebrews and the Pastorals, would make a roll half as long again as Luke, perhaps as much as 50 feet. The four Gospels would make something like 110 feet. Egyptian hieroglyphic rolls often ran to 50 feet, sometimes to 100, and in one case, the Harris Papyrus which chronicles the reign of Ramses II, to 133 feet in length. But Greek papyrus rolls almost never exceed 35 feet, and commonly seem to have fallen between 20 and 30 feet.

The Chester Beatty and Michigan biblical papyri and the seven Mani volumes suggest much which only other similar discoveries can clarify and establish. It is a noteworthy item that one volume consisted of five books, the four Gospels and Acts. Does this testify to a recollection of the intimate relation between Luke and Acts, or does it recall the fact that the Old Testament begins with a Pentateuch? In this connection is to be placed the epigram of Crinagoras addressed to Antonia, the niece of Augustus, which began, "The sweet pentade of lyric books in this *teuchos* brings the works of the inimitable

[54] Books and Readers, 63.

Graces." [55] Sanders argues, apparently with good reason, that *teuchos* in these lines is not necessarily a book box, as Birt once insisted, but could well have been a codex, that in any case the word was commonly used for "book," whether roll or codex, in the second century, when Ptolemaios and later Tertullian used it, and that, as applied to the five books of Moses, it meant a codex from the beginning.[56]

However that may be, the Chester Beatty papyri present us with an early third-century pentateuch codex which runs to such a size that it threatened to become unwieldy. As a single quire it would have been uneconomical because of the narrowness of the leaves toward the center of the gathering. It had reached the stage of diminishing returns. A volume of such size in quires of single sheets must have been hard to bind. It was not until the custom became established of binding together numerous gatherings, or quires, of from six to ten double leaves each, as in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and the Mani volumes, that it became possible to put the New Testament books into one or two volumes. It may well be that the factor of size, as well as a growing feeling for the unique character of the Gospels, led to the relegation of the Book of Acts to the third of the divisions of the New Testament, along with the General Epistles, before such codices arose as Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi rescriptus, where a division into volumes was no longer necessary.

As the Gospels and Acts became the Christian Pentateuch, Paul's letters became the companion prophetic volume. In the Chester Beatty Paul, Hebrews appears after Romans and before the Corinthian letters, as the second item. Otherwise the arrangement is in the descending order of size. Hebrews, though smaller, is placed before 1 Corinthians doubtless because its size would properly place it between 1 and 2 Corinthians. Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1 Thessalonians follow as they should. Second Thessalonians is missing, but doubtless came last. The calculations which have been made as to the size of the codex agree that it must have had

[55] Anthologia Palatina ix. 239. See Birt, Abriss, pp. 333, 341, 350, on pentads.

[56] Op. cit. (above, note 5), 104 f.

more pages than were necessary for these letters, but not enough for the three Pastorals. Are we to suppose that they were omitted as not yet accepted? Were the final pages glued together to form a cover? These are questions that cannot be answered. It is to be hoped that the volume from the same library containing the General Epistles and perhaps the Pastorals may eventually come to light.

The casual, nonliterary procedure which the early Christians surely would have followed in the beginning is a matter of no little importance. It explains why Marcion had only ten letters of Paul and does not even know of the Pastorals, whereas Polycarp seems to have had thirteen. It explains why the order of the books varies so greatly within the codices, Hebrews appearing second in the Chester Beatty Paul, John second, and Mark last in the Gospels-Acts codex as in the Freer Gospels. It explains the variations in the last three chapters of Romans. Such irregularities were an inevitable concomitant of the freedom which produced the "Western" text.[57] Each individual, copying for himself or his church, did what was right in his own eyes.

The date when Paul's letters were assembled into a unified collection must be determined by other data. Doubtless as a collection they preceded the Gospels as they did in composition. In Christianity prophecy anticipated law. The author of Luke-Acts did not have Paul's letters in his hands. It is not certain but it is possible that the John of Revelation had the complete collection, for he prefaces his work with a corpus of epistles. Fortunately the codex, as Martial proves, was already in use before there can have been any thought of making a Pauline collection.

The fugitive sheets and the small rolls or codices on which Paul's writings were preserved may easily have suffered no little disarrangement and damage before the attempt was made

[57] Harnack's argument, Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926), 13, that only the circulation of the Pauline corpus in several rolls explains the variation in their order in our later codices seems to me to mean nothing. In the beginning no copyist was bound to copy all of them or to preserve any fixed order. Nothing was "canonized" at first.

to put them together. I leave it to others to guess whether the three letters which are thought to have been combined into 2 Corinthians could more easily have become disarranged and confused if their original form were rolls or if it were codices, *tabellae*. Perhaps rolls thrust again and again into *capsae* might easily become torn and dislocated as the sources of 2 Corinthians are supposed to have been.

Yet in small *tabellae*, the first and last pages of the longer letters could easily suffer damage. The first little letter to the Corinthians (1 Co. 5.9) was probably a single sheet. If it became torn or worn and was thrust into a thin codex which held Paul's fourth letter, the peculiarity of its putative position after 2 Corinthians 6.13 is explained. If the larger letter were written on a roll, the dislocation, or interruption, must have been due to misplaced editorial acumen. Since at Rome letters were frequently written on *tabellae*, of waxed wood or of parchment, there is no reason why Paul should not have used that form.

However the originals may have been written, many years before Paul's letters were collected the parchment codex had been invented and was ready to receive them, doubtless as one volume, not as two. If they had been put into rolls, two would have been required, as Professor Goodspeed notes.[58] He is correct in saying that "mechanically speaking," a two-volume edition of Paul would naturally follow a two-volume edition of Luke-Acts. But there is no evidence for a two-volume edition of Paul. And was the process mechanical? Is it correct to put Paul and Luke-Acts on the same level? Luke-Acts was a "publication" intended for persons familiar with literary traditions. If the argument of this paper is correct, Paul's letters, in the beginning, were not published but collected by some person or church for their own use. There is no suggestion in Polycarp's "covering letter" to the Philippians that either they or he were "publishing," in the sense of preparing for sale or distribution, multiple copies of the letters of Ignatius [59] which he was sending them at their request.

As has often been pointed out, this incident is doubtless a

[58] Christianity Goes to Press, 55.

[59] Polycarp, Ad Phil. 13. 2.

perfect picture of the process by which Paul's letters were collected into a corpus. In the beginning it was no corpus at all, but just a copy of such letters as became known to some Christian or some church having wide contacts, either by letter or by travel, with other Christians or churches. The process of collection was doubtless as nonliterary as the original process of composition. As they were copied, each copyist became an editor and, therefore, various collections had various letters and in different orders. Luke was definitely writing for publication. Paul wrote for edification and the collection of his letters had the same motive.

That the collection may have taken place after the publication of Luke-Acts and may have been suggested by its appearance, as Professor Goodspeed argues, is a most plausible hypothesis.[60] That this was "the climax of Christian publication" is doubtful. Rather one would call Luke-Acts the beginning of Christian publication and reserve the "climax" for the middle or latter part of the second century, when Justin Martyr, Hermas, and others were publishing, when the Petrine literature, Paul and Thekla, and numerous apocryphal Gospels were being written, and when the forerunners of the Chester Beatty biblical papyri were being copied by trained scribes. There can be no doubt that this publishing activity had much to do with the conquest of the Roman Empire, which was practically complete, though unnoticed, by the end of the second century. To this conquest the use of the codex must have made a very large contribution.

The codex rendered another service to which allusion has already been made. It saved many books from loss or destruction. Harnack has called attention to the danger which both the Gospels, especially the Synoptics, and Paul's letters ran at the hands of the orthodox church fathers of the fourth and the following centuries.[61] Before the middle of the second century the author of 2 Peter complains of Paul's letters, and Marcion rejects three of the Gospels and puts Galatians first in his Paul. Harnack believes that the church fathers would have set Paul's

[60] Op. cit., 49–78, ch. III, 'The Climax of Christian Publication.'

[61] Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus (Leipzig, 1926), p. 2.

letters aside before 200 A.D. had it been possible.[62] Canonization, to which the codex made a large contribution, saved them. But it could hardly have saved all of them, even after canonization, if they had not been bound together in codices, the books that were disliked protected by those which did not seem heretical to growing catholic orthodoxy.

The data, then, literary and archaeological, Christian and pagan, clearly support the hypothesis that the Christian Scriptures in part were written in codices from the very beginning and that the collection of the documents into a book of Gospels and into another of Paul's letters was made possible by the previous invention of the parchment and papyrus codex. Like the little books themselves, the collections were informal and nonliterary and were put into codices largely because the Christians were practical, nonliterary people who were not at all under the influence of literary fashion and had no thought of publication in the ordinary sense but were only concerned to get their "New Covenant," as well as the Old, into a cheap and convenient form for constant use. The books themselves, their collection into codices, and their eventual canonization were all informal, spontaneous, democratic processes. They were products of the vigorous life of the early church.

ADDENDUM

Almost with the proof of this article the post brought AJSL 58, 3 (July, 1941), containing articles by Drs. Parker and Bowman (pp. 295 ff., 302–13) on a papyrus page from an Aramaic journal from the Memphis arsenal "dated with certainty to the reign of Xerxes, in a period from October 25, 472 B.C., to May 17, 471." While Dr. Parker cautiously adds (p. 296, note 29) that the fragments may come from the end of a papyrus roll, the fact that both sides carry similar materials and closely related dates speaks strongly for a page of a codex. Persian officials are again responsible for a departure from Egyptian custom, if this conclusion is correct. It seems almost incredible that a leaf book should be in use so early.

[62] Op. cit., 70, notes 1, 2.

The interesting article by Dr. A. W. Hummel in the latest number of JAOS 61, 2 (June, 1941), 71–76, 'The Development of the Book in China,' should also be compared. The "accordion-pleated" roll, the first step toward a book, cannot now be dated earlier than the T'ang period (618–907), although the similar wood-slip book, like the wooden tabella, dates back to the first century B.C. at the latest. The related but divergent process of evolution is significant.

THE WESTERN CHURCH AND ASTROLOGY DURING THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES[1]

M. L. W. LAISTNER
Cornell University

It is now nearly forty years ago that two scholars independently drew attention to Ambrosiaster's attacks on the paganism of his age. Cumont in a brilliant article, La polémique de l'Ambrosiaster contre les paiens, analyzed and discussed Quaestio CXIIII, Adversus paganos, and Quaestio CXV, De fato, of the writer whose identity must still be regarded as uncertain.[2] The purpose of Souter's admirable monograph, A study of Ambrosiaster, was quite different. Primarily he was concerned to prove once and for all that the pseudo-Augustinian Quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti CXXVII were composed by the same author as the highly individual commentary on the thirteen epistles of St. Paul included among the works of Ambrose. The common authorship of the two works is now universally accepted. Souter's book was also a preliminary study for his definitive edition of the Quaestiones which appeared some years later in the Vienna Corpus. To prove his main contention he instituted a careful comparison of the Biblical citations in the two treatises, of the language, and of the opinions expressed on a great variety of topics. Amongst these last was a strong dislike for astrology and astrologers; this was frequently noticeable in the commentary, but found its fullest expression in Quaestio CXV. Nevertheless most modern investigators who have touched on astrology during the Later Empire have ignored the writings of this unknown contemporary of Jerome and Pope Damasus. The sweeping generalization, however, with which Cumont concluded his article, seems to have been generally approved; at least no serious attempt to test its validity has been made. In 1903 he wrote as follows:

Mais tandis que la magie se perpétua à travers tout le moyen âge, l'Eglise latine réussit à la longue à détruire cette superstition savante. Alors que,

[1] I wish to thank Professor A. D. Nock for a number of bibliographical hints and Dr. C. W. Jones for his help on computistical matters.

[2] Revue d'hist. et de litt. relig., 8 (1903), 417–440.

dans l'empire byzantin, des empereurs même devenaient ses adeptes, comme Léon le Sage, ou ses défenseurs, comme Manuel Comnène, elle resta à peu près ignorée en Occident depuis l'époque franque jusqu'au XIIe siècle. La *Mathesis* de Firmicus Maternus est le dernier traité théorique sur la matière qui nous ait été conservé, et l'on ne trouve presque aucun manuscrit carolingien où il soit question d'astrologie. Celle-ci ne recommença à se répandre en Europe que sous l'influence des Arabes, et si elle jouit à la Renaissance d'une vogue éphémère elle le dut au prestige que lui prêta la science grecque et le grand nom de Ptolémée.

In the latest edition of his masterly book on the Oriental religions of the Roman Empire, published in 1929, he expresses virtually the same opinion.[3] The primary purpose of this essay is to review the existing evidence for the Latin-speaking West from the time of Constantine to the end of the ninth century. This is the more necessary because most recent writers have tended to concentrate all or most of their attention on astrology in the Eastern Mediterranean World; and, though Cumont and Toutain, for example, have touched on some of the Latin material, not a little of this seems so far to have been entirely ignored. There is, moreover, a certain tendency to dogmatize about the popularity or unpopularity of a given author in the Middle Ages without taking seriously into account the invaluable light often thrown by medieval library catalogues, as well as by the extant manuscripts. Yet these are sometimes the safest guide to truth when the purpose is to ascertain the beginning or the revival of intellectual trends that are altogether new or else have lain dormant for a considerable period of time. That the final conclusions to be drawn from the available data are very different from Cumont's thesis is the conviction of the present writer. It is for his readers to judge whether he has made good his case.

Refutations of 'Scientific' Astrology [4]

One fruitful source of confusion in books and articles dealing with our subject has been a failure to distinguish clearly be-

[3] Les religions orientales[4], 290, note 63.

[4] The following abbreviations have been used throughout: PL and PG refer to Migne's Patrologia Latina and Patrologia Graeca, references being to volume, column, and, if possible, section. CSEL is the Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, references being to volume, page, and line. The modern literature on ancient astrology

tween 'scientific' and popular astrology. Modern inquirers are not entirely to blame if they have often confused the two; for the line of demarcation between them is sometimes blurred and, in addition, the ancient sources themselves are not always as precise as one could wish.[5] Astrology, the illegitimate sister of astronomy, had become thoroughly acclimatized in the Greek World of the Hellenistic Age. That it came to the Greeks from the Orient is clear, although the contributions made respectively by Babylonia and by Egypt may still be a matter of dispute.[6] If at that time it met with the strongest opposition from certain philosophical schools, like the Sceptics and the New Academy, some of its doctrines met with approval from the later Stoics, notably from Posidonius. The Jews rejected astrology decisively. Certain passages in the Old Testament, as will appear later, were in due course cited by Christian commentators in their anti-astrological polemic. About the middle of the second century B.C. the Jewish compiler of certain Sibylline oracles spoke in no uncertain voice:[7] 'There is a city down in the land of Ur of the Chaldees, from which comes a race of most righteous men, who ever give themselves up to sound counsel

---

is enormous, but it may be helpful to indicate a few works containing ample bibliographical information: Franz Boll, Studien über Claudius Ptolemaeus (Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Supplementband 21 [1894], especially 181–238); Franz Cumont, Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain (ed. 4, 1929), ch. VII and 284–292; A. D. Nock, Sallustius, lxx–lxxv; J. Toutain, Les cultes païens dans l'empire romain II, 179–223; W. Gundel in Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyclopädie, s. v. Heimarmene. The same writer's survey in Bursian's Jahresberichte 243 covers the period from 1907 to 1933. It must, however, be used with caution, as it is not always wholly trustworthy. Thus, for instance, Gundel states (p. 147) that Duhem's discussion extends from pp. 459 to 494 and is devoted to an examination of the Church Fathers' views on astrology and particularly Augustine's at different periods of his life. Actually the astrological part of Duhem's chapter extends only from 454 to 460 and Duhem confines himself almost exclusively to examining the fifth book of the City of God! The reference to Boll's article in Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft should be vol. 18 (1917–18), not 17 (1916). Gundel also omits to mention J. K. Fotheringham's article in Journ. Theol. Stud. 10 (1909), 116–119.

[5] In particular there is the unfortunate tendency, as we shall see, in both official and unofficial references to astrology to group it with magic, augury, divination, and other pagan rites and superstitions. Cf. below, page 264, also Apostolic Constitutions, 8, 32, 11 (ed. Funk, I, 536, 3–9).

[6] Cf. the judicious remarks of A. D. Nock in Gnomon, 15 (1939), 363–364.

[7] R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O. T., II, 382–383.

and fair deeds. For they search not out the circling course of the sun or the moon, nor monstrosities beneath the earth, nor the depth of Ocean's shimmering sea, nor portents of sneezes, and birds of augurers, nor wizards, nor magicians, nor enchanters, nor the deceits of ventriloquist's foolish words, nor do they study the predictions of Chaldaean astrology, nor do they astronomize: for all these things are in their nature prone to deceive, such things as witless men are searching out day by day, exercising their souls for a work of no profit.' Philo, besides condemning the pseudo-science in many of his writings, devoted a whole treatise to Providence in which a considerable section is directed against believers in fatalism and star-lore.[8] To the Christian teacher all forms of astrology were from the first abominable, the popular varieties, because they were pagan superstitions with a wide appeal, the 'scientific,' because it sought to substitute for God and the operation of Divine Grace and Providence a fatalistic scheme of the Universe in which the life and fortunes of every man were rigidly predetermined from the moment of birth or even of conception. As long as Christianity was itself a *religio illicita*, Christian authors in general had more pressing tasks than the detailed rebuttal of doctrines whose original home was traditionally believed to be Chaldaea. Here and there a word of condemnation may occur, as in Tertullian or Lactantius, but longer disquisitions are still rare. Bardesanes' lost work, however, belonged to the second century, while Hippolytus devoted a section of his Philosophumena to astrology. After expressing strong disapproval of it, he expounds its tenets, taking his material from Sextus Empiricus. The all-embracing mind of Origen, too, had touched on the 'science' of the stars in more than one of his works.[9] There were also related topics that called forth vigorous protests from the orthodox. Tertullian composed a tract combatting Hermogenes' hypothesis of eternally existent matter, while in the East Methodius sought to controvert Origen's similar conten-

[8] Cf. numerous references listed by P. Wendland, Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung, 24, note 1.

[9] Tertullian, de idol. (CSEL, 20, 38, 3 ff.); Lactantius, Inst. (CSEL, 19, 167, 1 ff.); Hippolytus, PG, 16, 3056C–3090A.

tion, *συναΐδιον εἶναι τῷ μόνῳ σοφῷ καὶ ἀπροσδεεῖ θεῷ τὸ πᾶν.*[10] With the establishment of Christianity as the official religion of the Empire treatises against astrology, like the suppression of various popular superstitions, became a more urgent need, the more so because certain concepts implicit in the pseudo-science found a place also in the speculations of Christian heretics and Gnostics. Thus during the fourth and fifth centuries anti-astrological literature became much more abundant. That there were still pagan opponents also can be seen in Hierocles' treatise on fate and in Sallustius' work on the gods.[11] Cyril of Alexandria indulged his finest vein of invective against the victimization of women and common folk by astrological practitioners: 'Dost see these fellows who own the workshops of deceit, the places where they sell their falsehoods? It is they who marvel all the while at shooting stars and now and then for a few pence prate of the mysteries in the heavens. They get women into their clutches, bewitch the minds of the common herd, and make their purses ripe for picking. Nay more, by filching trifling profits they collect for themselves the wages for their quite insipid marvel-mongering. Yet, as says the enemy of truth, they are learning heaven's all-directing destiny (*τὴν πάντα κραίνουσαν οὐρανοῦ ψῆφον*) in the movement of the stars! We would convict them of being cheats and liars and utterly ignorant of truth.'[12] In general, however, Christian refutations of astrology are either full-dress discourses on fatalism or else they are briefer statements by Biblical commentators called forth by a passage or episode in Scripture. To the former class belong the treatises on fate by Diodorus of Tarsus and by Gregory of Nyssa, Nemesius' discourse on the nature of man, and two notable poems, De providentia, by Gregory of Nazianzus; and in Latin, Ambrosiaster's Quaestio CXV and a series of chapters in the fifth book of Augustine's City of God. To the second group may be assigned extended treatments of the subject in the commentaries of Basil the Great, Procopius of Gaza, and Ambrose, on Genesis, and in the exposition of Job

[10] Methodius ap. Photium, PG, 103, 1140C ff.
[11] Hierocles ap. Photium, ibid., 702D–703A.
[12] PG, 76, 1052B.

by Julian of Halicarnassus, besides briefer comments in other expositors.

It has been shown long since that the main arguments, as well as much of the illustrative material, set out by these writers had become stereotyped by the Late Imperial Age; for ultimately they go back to the later Hellenistic period, to Carneades and the New Academy, and in some degree to the Stoics. Boll, whose contribution to the subject is most valuable, has pointed out that from the second century B.C. to Byzantine times two main lines of argument against astrological fatalism are elaborated to a greater or less degree by all its critics. In the first place they pose the question, how can it be maintained that the physical and mental peculiarities of a man depend on the position of the stars at the time of his birth or conception, when actually the same bodily and mental characteristics are to a great extent found in all the members of one people? In order to show that the question is not only legitimate but unanswerable by their opponents a great wealth of illustrations is used. Augustine and others discuss fully the case of twins. We feel that Ambrosiaster missed an opportunity when he contented himself with recording Roman forerunners of the Dionne quintuplets, without elaborating the astrological complications attendant on so unusual an occurrence![13] Diodorus again, so far from confining himself to human kind, treats at length of animals and plants. Secondly, the Christian writers attack vigorously the doctrine that certain planets or signs of the zodiac influence given geographical areas and determine the manners and customs of those who inhabit them. Rather, it was argued, the particular characteristics of an individual in a certain geographical region prove that his life is determined not by the natal or prenatal influence of a star or constellation, but by his own untrammeled will.[14] Many of the *exempla* used, whether to illustrate national customs or natural phenomena that bring benefits or disaster in their train, occur again and again in our authors. Thus they instance circumcision and the

[13] CSEL, 50, 342, 13–16 — *legitur namque cautum in quodam iuris libello aliquando mulierem quinque peperisse: quomodo subreptum est fatis, ut huic soli hoc natura decerneret, quod non erat fati? quod si fati fuisset, aliquantae hac sorte oneratae fuissent.*

[14] Cf. Boll, Studien, 183 ff.

observance of the Mosaic Law as common to all Jews, wherever their place of residence. Certain sexual practices, which Greeks and Romans regarded as incestuous, are characteristic of the Persians, while the Amazons afford an example of a strange social and economic organization.[15] Similarly, general allusions to earthquakes, inundations, war, pestilence, drought, and famine partake of the nature of commonplaces in these writers, although they treat the topic with varying degrees of elaboration. What is of far greater interest is that two, Gregory of Nyssa and Ambrosiaster, enliven the narrative by introducing personal experiences. Gregory recalls a violent manifestation of nature in a way which leaves no doubt that he is speaking as an eye-witness.[16]

Who does not know [he remarks] that such disturbances of the earth arise not merely in its inhabited regions but in those that are uninhabited? Whoever has seen the Sangaean mountain range that lies on the borders of Bithynia, or has heard tell of it by others, will know that I speak truth when I say that the entire mountain ridge has subsided down to the level of the road passing through and affords a terrifying spectacle to the traveller. Similar convulsions have occurred in Paphlagonian territory, and in some places human dwellings have been swallowed up in these chasms. In many regions, when such a calamity happens, we see the area denuded of its inhabitants. And what need is there for me to refer individually to Cyprus, Pisidia, and Achaea, where there are many signs of the disasters that I have named?

A little earlier he had enumerated a number of historical examples from the past and then continued: [17]

But even if we pass all these occurrences by, the events of our own life-time furnish sufficient proof of what has been said. Who does not know that the great capital of Bithynia, numbered amongst the world's outstanding cities, and the broad and spacious land of Thrace were utterly and without warning laid in ruins, the one by an earthquake and fire, the other by war? How many there — children, infants, young and old men, free men and slaves, victors and vanquished, rich and poor, healthy and sick — perished in a moment of time?

On the 21st July, 365, when Gregory was about thirty years of age, a violent earthquake accompanied by tidal waves occurred, which caused great devastation and suffering in various parts

[15] Cf., for example, PG, 103, 864A (Diodorus); PG, 45, 169B–C (Gregory of Nyssa); Rhein. Mus., 55, 332 (Julian of Halicarnassus); PG, 1, 1410B, 1412A, 1414B–C (ps.-Clement); CSEL, 50, 323, 5–9, 324, 17–19, 344, 3–21 (Ambrosiaster); and generally Boll, op. cit., 202 ff., Nock, Sallustius, lxxii and 19.

[16] PG, 45, 168B–C.

[17] Ibid., 165B.

of the Eastern Aegean, as well as in Constantinople and the vicinity. Our chief informant about the event is Ammianus, but there are allusions in other authors as well.[18] It seems highly probable, though modern historians of the period seem to have ignored the passages quoted, that Gregory is alluding to this disaster, which may well have affected Pontus where he was at that time residing. As for the utter devastation of Thrace by war, the most likely interpretation would find in this allusion a reference to those Visigothic invasions that culminated in 378 in the battle of Adrianople. If this contention be correct, it also provides a *terminus post quem* for the composition of Gregory's treatise. Ambrosiaster, too, whose writings are diversified by many apt illustrations drawn from his reading or his own experience, makes mention of a contemporary misfortune, when he speaks of the desolation of Pannonia. He doubtless had in mind the destruction caused by the Quadi and Sarmatians in 374.[19]

Among the poems of Gregory of Nazianzus are two, written respectively in hexameters and in iambic senarii, which are less known than they deserve to be.[20] Both are entitled *περὶ προνοίας*, and set forth with considerable elegance and not a little poetic imagery the traditional arguments in favor of a Divine Providence. Both in consequence contain passages against fatalism and its 'scientific' justification, astrology. In one there is an allusion to the Star of Bethlehem, and the poet relates how even the Magi were converted, abandoned their craft, and adored Christ. In the other poem five lines of Aristotelian precision deserve to be quoted:[21]

ἔρροιεν οἱ Πρόνοιαν ἐξηρνηκότες
ὥσπερ τὸ σώζεσθ' ἐκ θεοῦ δεδοικότες
ἀλλ' ἢ φορᾷ νέμοντες ἀστάτῳ τὸ πᾶν,
ἢ καὶ δίδοντες ἀστέρων κινήμασι,
τοῖς πῶς, πόθεν τε, κἀκ τίνος, κινουμένοις.

[18] Ammian., 26, 10, 15–19; cf. Otto Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt, V, 79 and 458 with the references there given.

[19] CSEL, 50, 334, 16–17; cf. generally Cumont in Revue d'hist. et de litt. relig., 8, 419, and Souter, A study of Ambrosiaster, 31 ff.; 168 ff.

[20] PG, 37, 424–429.

[21] Ibid., 430A.

Substantial as was the anti-astrological literature of the Greek World, most of it remained unknown to the Latin-speaking West. An exception was the novelistic composition of the pseudo-Clement, for the Recognitions were translated by Rufinus; and Ambrose was familiar with both Basil and Origen. Augustine's views, based on Cicero, are expounded most fully in his City of God. Astrology, he there argues, must be rejected not only by Christians, but by pagans who believe in the gods; for to accept it is in effect an admission of atheism. He then embarks on a lengthy argument regarding true twins and twins of opposite sex. In the course of it he reviews the scientific opinions of Hippocrates and the unscientific superstitions of Posidonius and Nigidius Figulus; he also devotes a whole chapter to the twin sons of Isaac, Esau and Jacob. In short the major part of Augustine's attack is levelled against only one part of astrological practice, genethlialogy or the casting of nativities. Subsequently he inveighs against the absurdity of doing certain things only on astrologically favorable days, a form of popular superstition that incurred the contempt of Ambrosiaster also.[22] In the seventh book Augustine derides the folly of identifying certain stars with certain gods, of calling planets after Mars, Venus, and Mercury. And why do constellations or the signs of the zodiac receive no temples or altars? Why are they not at least reckoned as plebeian deities? [23] The briefer discussion of astrology in the commentary on Genesis adds nothing further, but the short letter to Lampadius is of some interest. It is wholly concerned with the danger to morality and human conduct inseparable from adherence to astrology. Implicit belief in fate and fortune undermines all laws and institutions, in short leads to anarchy. Augustine writes with a certain pawky humor and gives us a glimpse of quasi-Oriental manners. The master of the house will correct his wife by blows, if she stares incessantly (*immoderatius*) out of the window instead of attending to her wifely duties. If she exclaims, 'why do you strike me; strike Venus who compels me to act thus,' he will realize how justified his chastisement is.[24] In the ninth

[22] CSEL, 40, 209–221; CSEL, 50, 345, 8–16.
[23] CSEL, 40, 323, 4–324, 9.
[24] Aug., Epist. 246 (CSEL, 57, 583, 17–585, 17).

book of the Recognitions the discussion is centred mainly on what Boll has called astrological ethnography. If there is little that is new and better stated elsewhere in the book, its influence in the West during the earlier Middle Ages was, as will appear hereafter, quite exceptional. Finally there is a Latin work of the early fifth century which seems to have been generally overlooked, although it throws a remarkable sidelight on our subject. In the Acts of St. Sebastian, once wrongly fathered on Ambrose, we read how the future saint visited the astrological laboratory of Chromatius. It had been built all of glass by Chromatius' father, Tarquinius, at a cost of more than two hundred pounds of gold. The episode appears to be so little known that it deserves quotation:[25]

Tunc ille: habeo, inquit, cubiculum holovitreum, in quo omnis disciplina stellarum ac mathesis mechanica est arte constructa, in cuius fabrica pater meus Tarquinius amplius quam ducenta pondo auri dignoscitur expendisse. Cui S. Sebastianus dixit: si hoc tu integrum habere volueris, te ipsum frangis. Chromatius dixit: quid enim? Mathesis aut ephemeris aliquo sacrificiorum usu coluntur, cum tantum eis mensium et annorum cursus certo numero per horarum spatia distinguuntur? et lunaris globi plenitudo vel diminutio, digitorum motu, rationis magisterio, et calculi computatione praevidetur? S. Polycarpus presbyter dixit: illic signa Leonis et Capricornii et Sagittarii et Scorpionis et Tauri sunt, illic in Ariete luna, in Cancro hora; in Iove stella, in Mercurio tropica, in Venere Mars, et in omnibus istis monstruosis daemonibus ars Deo inimica cognoscitur.

Sebastian's arguments which follow ultimately prevail with Chromatius. He is converted, *universa idola crystallina et holovitrea et omne opus illud mechanicum* are destroyed, and an angelic messenger appears from heaven. The refutation of astrology is to a great extent based on the ninth book of the Recognitions, even to exact verbal correspondences here and there.

When we pass to certain episodes or quotations in the Bible which bear on our subject, it is natural to begin with the Star that guided the Magi to Bethlehem. To the author of the Protevangelium Jacobi and to Ignatius it was a star that outshone all other stars.[26] In the Infancy Gospel it is a guid-

[25] PL, 17, 1044D–1047B; the passage cited is on 1045A–B.

[26] J. A. Fabricius, Codex apocryphus novi testamenti, I, 115 — *ἀστέρα παμμεγέθη, λάμψαντα ἐν τοῖς ἄστροις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀμβλύνοντα τοὺς ἄλλους ἀστέρας ὥστε μὴ*

ing angel, a version readily explicable as a contamination of Matthew, 2, 9–10 with Luke, 2, 9–10.[27] The Fathers of the Eastern Church, however, adopted a more mystical explanation, while the fact that they found it necessary to controvert an astrological interpretation proves that this last was widely believed. Basil the Great, for instance, begins his discussion of the phenomenon with the challenging sentence: 'let no one drag in the paraphernalia of astrology (*τὴν τῆς ἀστρολογίας κατασκευὴν*) to explain the rising of the star.' It was not one of the regular stars, neither was it a comet.[28] Diodorus of Tarsus and John Chrysostom describe it in very similar terms as not one of the familiar heavenly bodies, but as a kind of divine power transformed into a star.[29] In a sermon on the Nativity attributed to Gregory of Nyssa the star of Bethlehem, unlike other stars which are either planets or fixed in the firmament, both moved and stood still.[30] It goes without saying that all these commentators strongly reprobate those who would bring the appearance of the star into astrological connection with Christ's birth. Ambrosiaster, like Diodorus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Jerome, makes the Magi familiar with the prophecy of Balaam, son of Beor (Num., 24, 17), and interpret the star, which they understood to be *extra ordinem mundi*, in a Messianic sense.[31] Gregory the Great in a homily on the Epiphany does not discuss the star; nevertheless he takes occasion to introduce an anti-astrological paragraph at this point.[32] Other passages in Scripture bearing directly on star-lore or lending themselves

---

φαίνεσθαι αὐτούς. Ignatius, Ephes. 19, in Kirsopp Lake, Apostolic Fathers, I, 192 — *ἀστὴρ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἔλαμψεν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκλάλητον ἦν, καὶ ξενισμὸν παρεῖχεν ἡ καινότης αὐτοῦ. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἄστρα ἅμα ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ χορὸς ἐγένετο τῷ ἀστέρι· αὐτος δὲ ἦν ὑπερβάλλων τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ πάντα.*

[27] Fabricius, op. cit., 173.

[28] PG, 31, 1469C ff.

[29] Diodorus, PG, 103, 877A — *δύναμίν τινα θειοτέραν εἰς ἄστρον μὲν σχηματιζομένην*, Chrysostom, PG, 57, 61 ff. — *δύναμίς τις ἀόρατος εἰς ταύτην μετασχηματισθεῖσα τὴν ὄψιν.*

[30] PG, 46, 1133D. That this is an authentic work by Gregory has been disputed by some, maintained by others. Cf. O. Bardenhewer, Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit., 3, 208. Boll, Zeitschrift für neutest. Wiss., 18, 40–48, scarcely concerns himself with the Eastern Fathers' interpretation of the Star of Bethlehem. The modern rationalism of Fotheringham (Journ. Theol. Stud., 10, 116–119) suggested that the star was Mars.

[31] CSEL, 50, Quaestio LXIII.

[32] See below, pages 268–269.

to astronomical or astrological exposition are few. The short dissertation against astrologers of Julian of Halicarnassus is introduced as a comment on Job, 38, 7, but the Latin commentators on this verse did not follow suit. Gregory the Great makes no remark, while in the exposition of the so-called Philippus the stars are identified as so many angels, but only in a tropological sense.[33] Isaiah's contemptuous allusion to 'the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators' (47, 13–14) and the fate that awaits them is explained by Jerome strictly with reference to the scriptural passage, that is to say, to the augury and star-lore of Babylonia. He is even briefer when he comments on Jeremiah, 10, 2, contenting himself with what is hardly more than a general definition: *proprie adversum eos loquitur qui venerantur caelestia et, quae in signa sunt posita annorum, temporum, mensuum et dierum, ab his aestimant regi humanum genus et ex causis caelestium terrena moderari.*[34] Maximin, the Arian, in denouncing pagans who worship the heavenly bodies and the elements, cites against them St. Paul (Rom., 1, 20–23) and the Book of Wisdom (13, 1–4).[35] The passage in Romans also elicits a short criticism from Ambrosiaster: 'for they esteem themselves wise men, because they think that they have searched out the working of the physical universe (*physicas rationes*), as they scan the courses of the stars and the properties of the elements, while scorning the Master of these. Thus they are foolish; for if these deserve praise, how much more so their Creator.' [36] Disapproval of astrology, as Souter long since pointed out, is expressed by this commentator again and again. If there are relatively few quotations from Scripture which lent themselves to polemic against astrology, there were, on the other hand, not a few occurrences which demonstrated the intervention of God in human affairs. To Christian authors desirous of disproving the inevitability of

[33] PL, 26, 619 ff.

[34] CSEL, 59, 128, 22–25. The two quotations from the prophets occur also in Diodorus (PG, 103, 876A–B).

[35] Journ. Theol. Stud., 17 (1915–16), 323, 81 ff. That the Arian bishop Maximin, not Maximus of Turin, was the author of this sermon has been shown by B. Capelle, Revue bénédictine, 34 (1922), 81 ff.

[36] PL, 17, 58A. A. Souter, A study of Ambrosiaster, 31–33.

fate such Biblical episodes were welcome material for illustrating their argument. Some are used many times, others are found only in a single author. Thus, both Gregory of Nyssa and Ambrosiaster group together Noah's preservation at the time of the Flood, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the drowning of Pharaoh's host in the Red Sea. Maximin, to exemplify the efficacy of prayer, instances the experience of Noah, Moses, Joshua, Elijah, and Jonah. Joshua and Hezekiah (II Kings, 20, 11) are introduced by Ambrosiaster, while Ambrose describes the miracle of Jonah, but takes his other examples from the New Testament — the penitent thief, Peter guided out of prison by an angel, Paul's blindness and recovery of his sight, his preservation from shipwreck and from the bite of the viper.[37]

The Western Church and Astrology

It is necessary in this section to distinguish as far as possible between official condemnation levelled specifically and exclusively against astrology and the efforts of the Church and its officers and writers to combat various popular and especially rustic superstitions which flourished like hardy perennials. And nothing is more remarkable than the paucity of evidence for the former, and the copious material for the latter. The entire sixteenth book of the Codex Theodosianus is devoted to matters of religion. Orthodoxy is defined, the status of the Church and its ministers is laid down, and a long series of ordinances against Jews and heretics is there collected. The tenth section, moreover, contains enactments against paganism, its temples, its rites and sacrifices; yet there is no mention of astrology. In the ninth book, however, which is concerned with criminal law, there are three brief entries. Two of these aim to suppress various practitioners of superstition, the third, beginning with the incisive words, *cesset mathematicorum tractatus*, is directed solely against astrologers. Finally, in an enactment of April 22, 386, included in the Constitutio Sirmondiana, the emperors grant pardon to divers offenders but exclude those

[37] PG, 45, 165A; CSEL, 50, 323, 10–18; Journ. Theol. Stud., 17, 329, 262 ff.; CSEL, 50, 333, 4–19; CSEL, 32, i, 119, 15–120, 2.

convicted of major crimes — murderers, adulterers, *in astra peccantes*, poisoners, magicians, coiners, and so forth.[38] Astrology was condemned by the Council of Toledo in 400 and by the Council held at Braga between 560 and 565.[39] But the phraseology makes it clear that the anathemas of the assembled bishops were directed specifically against the Priscillianists. This heretical sect is also the object of Leo I's severe condemnation. In a remarkable letter he fulminates against impiety 'which, not content with accepting the false teaching of those who under cover of Christ's name have strayed from the Gospels, has plunged itself into the darkness of heathendom, so that by the profane secrets of magic arts and the empty lies of astrologers (*mathematicorum vana mendacia*) they might place the faith of religion and the reason for their conduct in the power of demons and in the action of the stars.' The result must be a suspension of law and order, the criminal will disclaim responsibility for his acts and blame the stars. The bishop goes on to define astrology somewhat more closely, a passage best cited in the original:

Ad hanc insaniam pertinet prodigiosa illa totius humani corporis per duodecim caeli signa distinctio ut diversis partibus diversae praesideant potestates; et creatura quam deus ad imaginem suam fecit, in tanta sit obligatione siderum in quanta est connexione membrorum. Merito patres nostri, sub quorum temporibus haeresis haec nefanda prorupit, per totum mundum instanter egere ut impius furor ab universa ecclesia pelleretur.

Here we have a very definite allusion to 'scientific' astrology with its doctrine of the regional influence of the stars; the last sentence shows that Leo is still thinking of the Priscillianists alone.[40] He reverts once more to astrology later in this letter and calls it the eleventh blasphemy of these heretics 'whereby they deem that men's souls and bodies are bound fast (*obstringi*) by the fatal stars.' In one of his sermons he denounces sun-worship at some length and in another there is a passing allusion to fatalism.[41] The second redaction of Dionysius Exiguus' first collection and translation of Church Canons was formally adopted for use by the Roman Church and consequently attained prime importance for the Latin-speaking world. In this

[38] Cod. Theod. (edd. Mommsen and Meyer), ix, 16, 4; ix, 16, 6; ix, 16, 8; page 913.
[39] Mansi, Concilia, 3, 1004, para. xv; 9, 775, para. ix and x.
[40] PL, 54, 679A–B. [41] Ibid., 685C; 218B–C; 434A.

work there is only one direct mention of astrology and its exponents, where Dionysius quotes from the acts of the Council of Laodicea, held in 365: [42]

quod non oportet sacerdotes aut clericos, magos aut incantatores esse, vel mathematicos vel astrologos aut facere quae dicuntur phylacteria, quae quidem sunt animarum ipsarum vincula.

Other citations allude only to divination and magic, while the somewhat later collections of Ferrandus and Cresconius add nothing further.[43]

In contrast to this scarcity of official condemnations of astrology there is abundant evidence to show how the Western Church struggled unceasingly to suppress rustic superstitions, fortune-telling, spells, and similar pagan abominations. Preachers like Maximus of Turin in the fifth or Caesarius of Arles and Martin of Braga in the sixth century inveighed against these practices, and their denunciations were echoed in later ages and sometimes in identical language by Eligius, Pirmin, and others. George, bishop of Ostia, writing to Pope Hadrian I in 786 mentions British synods that he had attended, where he had counselled the British bishops to proceed against augury and other such heathen survivals.[44] Prohibition of magic, augury, and other superstitious customs and beliefs is found frequently in the penitential literature.[45] Yet astrology and astrologers as such are mentioned infrequently. Caesarius, who in his sermons thunders again and again at his hearers for relapsing into all manner of pagan usages, alludes only twice to *mathematici*, in one case coupling them with the Manicheans and condemning the familiar irresponsibility argument of the fatalists.[46] In a

[42] PL, 67, 74B.

[43] Ibid., 54B; 156A–B; 168C; Ferrandus, ibid., 955C; Cresconius, PL, 88, 876C.

[44] Maximus, PL, 57, 483C; Caesarius, see the indexes in Morin's edition of the sermons; Martin, De correctione rusticorum (ed. C. P. Caspari), passim; M. L. W. Laistner, Harv. Theol. Rev., 31 (1938), 270–271 with references there given; Monum. Germ. Hist., Epist., IV, 21, 33–34.

[45] J. T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer, Medieval Handbooks of Penance, 198; 228–229; 276–277; 288; 331.

[46] Sermo XVIII (ed. Morin, 82, 15) and LIX (249, 8 ff.) — *Dicit homini serpens ille per mathematicos et Manicheos, ne confiteatur homo peccatum. Per mathematicos sic loquitur: Numquid homo peccat? stellae sic sunt positae; necesse est ut faciat homo peccatum. Dicit ergo per mathematicos, quia stella facit ut homo peccet; nam ipse non peccat. Sic blasphemias convertit in deum: creator enim stellarum deus est.*

third sermon he disapproves the pagan names of the week and instructs his congregation to say *prima, secunda, tertia feria* instead of *dies Martis, dies Mercurii, dies Iovis*.[47] In the Penitentials the *mathematicus* is described only twice and in almost identical words: 'if any one is a *mathematicus*, that is, if he takes away the mind of a man by the invocation of demons, he shall do penance for five years, one year on bread and water.' Thus, at least in the Penitentials the word *mathematicus* has lost its original meaning; he is a sorcerer, not an exponent of star-lore.[48] Perhaps, however, the most significant circumstance of all is this: Dr. Charles W. Jones, who, as the result of prolonged acquaintance with the extant manuscripts, is thoroughly familiar with the computistical literature of the earlier Middle Ages, has assured the present writer that there is a complete absence of astrological material in the *computi* down to the end of the ninth century. And though, as will appear hereafter, astrological literature began to circulate again in that century, it scarcely affected the *computi* until the tenth. But in the later compilations of the eleventh and twelfth centuries the addition of frankly astrological lore to computistical works is not unusual.

The chief authors from the sixth to the eighth centuries have little to say about our subject beyond generalities. Gregory of Tours in his little astronomical treatise, which in any case does not seem to have enjoyed more than local success, adheres strictly to scientific astronomy and disclaims expressly any astrological purpose, *quia non in his mathesim doceo neque futura praescrutare praemoneo*.[49] Cassiodorus, after pointing out the practical value of astronomy for navigators and farmers, proceeds:

> cetera vero quae se ad cognitionem siderum coniungunt, id est ad notitiam fatorum, et fidei nostrae sine dubitatione contraria sunt, sic ignorari debent, ut nec scripta esse videantur.

[47] Sermo CXCIII (744, 31–34). Yet in the second century a Christian apologist had used the pagan names of the week without demur. Justin Martyr (Apol., I, 67), speaking of the Passion, wrote: *τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν κρονικήν, ἥτις ἐστιν ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεὶς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδαξε κτλ.* No example of *ἡ κρονικὴ* in this sense is given in the new edition of Liddell and Scott.

[48] McNeill and Gamer, op. cit., 277 and 306.

[49] Monum. Germ. Hist., Script. Merov., I, 863, 12–15; and cf. generally M. L. W.

He reinforces his condemnation by appealing to the authority of Basil and Augustine.[50] There is also a brief mention in his commentary on the Psalms; it shows how he was aware that astrology had had its pagan opponents too.[51] Isidore of Seville, as might be expected of an encyclopedist, provides a variety of information. Its significance is obvious in view of the immense popularity that his works enjoyed in the earlier medieval period. He expresses the usual disapproval of astrology that befitted a sound Churchman. Astronomy is natural (*naturalis*), whereas astrology is partly natural, partly superstitious — *superstitiosa vero est quam mathematici sequuntur qui in stellis augurantur.*[52] Yet he is not wholly untainted by its tenets when he speaks approvingly of those who would associate bodily changes with

---

Laistner, Thought and Letters in Western Europe, 99. It is significant that only one manuscript containing the whole of Gregory's treatise survives, though the introductory section on human and divine Wonders was copied frequently.

[50] Cassiod., Inst. (ed. Mynors), 156, 23–157, 2. The Augustine reference is to the De doctrina Christiana (PL, 34, 57), where the African Father expresses the opinion that astronomy is harmless, but of little value for the study of Scripture. It is best avoided because astrology is related to it.

[51] PL, 70, 505B — *astrologiam . . . quam etiam nobilium philosophorum iudicia damnaverunt.*

[52] Etym., 3, 27, 1–2. One possible source of confusion, it is well to remind oneself, is to be found in the words *astrologia, astrologus* themselves. In classical Latin these had been used invariably both for the science and the pseudo-science and their exponents. *Astronomia, astronomus* came into use only in the Silver Latin Age and later (cf. Thes. linguae latinae, s. v.). Now, although *astronomia, astronomus* became more and more common, the older words continued to be used in both senses even by one and the same writer. Bede, for example, employs *astronomia* in E. H., 4, 2, but in his commentary on the six days of Creation, in the sentence *stellae quas planetas, id est, errantes, vocant astrologi,* the last word obviously signifies astronomers. Similarly, in D. T. R., 36, a passage derived from the Latin Josephus, *astrologia* and *geometria* are coupled and described as *gloriosae utilitatis.* More than a century later John the Scot consistently writes *astrologia* and its derivatives, when he means astronomy; cf. PL, 122, 866B; 869C — *astrologiam cuius maxima vis est motus siderum per loca et tempora considerare*; and in 716C he speaks of *astrologica supputatio,* astronomical reckoning. In the earliest library catalogues the work of Hyginus and sometimes the Latin Aratus are described as *liber astrologiae,* and this title is found side by side with *liber astronomiae* as late as the fifteenth century. Hyginus himself had of course employed *astrologia* consistently to mean astronomy, but it is easy to see how the uninitiated student in the Middle Ages might be led astray by the survival of this earlier Latin usage. For the popularity of Hyginus and the Latin Aratus in the Middle Ages cf. Max Manitius, Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen, 80–82, who lists 43 manuscripts varying in date from the early ninth to the sixteenth century.

the qualities of the stars.[53] He devotes a lengthy chapter, entitled De magis, to every kind of hocus-pocus and its exponents; in the course of it he provides his readers with definitions of *astrologi*, *genethliaci*, *geneses*, *mathematici*, *horoscopi*, but adds the face-saving observation:[54]

> cuius artis (i.e. astrology) scientia usque ad evangelium fuit concessa ut Christo edito nemo exinde nativitatem alicuius de caelo interpretaretur.

Finally, in another of his writings he classifies philosophy into seven kinds, the four which the Middle Ages grouped together as the *quadrivium* with the addition of astrology, mechanics, and medicine. This classification reappears in Aldhelm and again in the ninth century.[55]

In Gregory the Great we meet with two highly characteristic utterances. He sneers at the names of the constellations which go back to the empty tales of Hesiod, Aratus, and Callimachus. Job (9, 9) did not follow their stories about Arcturus or Orion, but Scripture uses the terms invented by students of secular wisdom, because they have become part of the common parlance.[56] More important for our purpose is the excursus on astrology that he introduced into his Homily on the Epiphany. He begins with a reference to the Priscillianists who to him, as to Leo I, seem to have been the main exponents of the pseudo-science and its doctrine of fate. He alludes briefly to the twins, Esau and Jacob, and then speaks scornfully of the supposed natal influence of the stars. Anyone born in the sign of Aquarius will become a fisherman. But Gaetulia is said to have none such. Who is to say that no one there is born under Aquarius, when there is not a single fisherman in that country? Those born under the sign of Libra are to become financiers (*trapezitae*). But in many districts there are no such persons at all. The astrologers must admit either that in those parts no one is born under the Balance or else that fate plays no part in their birth. Those of royal and of servile stock, though born under the same star, nevertheless live and end their lives as princes or

[53] Etym., 4, 3, 4. [54] Ibid., 8, 9.

[55] Liber numerorum (PL, 83, 188B); for the seven *genera* in Aldhelm see Monum. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant., XV, 71, 23 and 277, 5. Cf. also below, page 272.

[56] PL, 75, 865C.

slaves respectively. The pope ends impatiently — *haec de stella breviter diximus, ne mathematicorum stultitiam indiscussam praeterisse videamur.* Alas! Much that sounds impressive when declaimed passionately and with well-rounded lips from pulpit or platform becomes singularly flat and unconvincing when seen in writing or in print.[57] Aldhelm, who follows Isidore in including astrology among the seven kinds of philosophy, denounces the ridiculous stupidity of its devotees with their doctrines of fate and natal influence.[58] Of much greater interest is a solitary passage in Bede, which deserves to be quoted in full:

Attamen mathematici in explorandis hominum genituris ad atomum usque pervenire contendunt, dum zodiacum circulum in XII signa, signa singula in partes XXX, partes item singulas in punctos XII, punctos singulos in momenta XL, momenta singula in ostenta LX distribuunt, ut considerata diligentius positione stellarum, fatum eius qui nascitur quasi absque errore deprehendant. Quae quia vana et a nostra fide aliena est observatio, neglecta ea videamus, potius quo apostolus ad celeritatem resurrectionis intimandam huiusmodi temporis vocabulo utitur, dicens: 'omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur, in atomo, in ictu oculi, in novissima tuba.' (I Cor., 15, 51–52)

In the earlier part of the chapter from which this quotation is taken Bede, whose purpose was to explain the divisions of the sun-dial, gave an account of the various subdivisions of time, ending with the smallest which is indivisible and which he called atom. He adds that others have employed the terms *punctus* or *momentum*. So far he had followed the so-called Irish computus; but then, with a passage in Ambrose in mind, he points out that the method of dividing up the heavens used by astrologers is closely analogous.[59]

[57] PL, 76, 1110A–1114B.

[58] In Monum. Germ. Hist. Auct. Ant., XV, 73, 6–10, he mentions the signs of the zodiac, *unde mathematici fatum, fortunam, vel genesim aut suprema Parcarum fila . . . se divinare et praenoscere posse ridiculosa stoliditate arbitrabantur.* There is a similar passage on 269, 5–7.

[59] Bede, D. T. R., 3 (PL, 90, 302 ff.); Irish computus, ibid., 653B; Ambrose, Hex., 4, 4, 14 (CSEL, 32, i, 121, 13–122, 10). As Ambrose's discussion closely resembles that of Procopius of Gaza, Wendland (Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung, 35, note 2) not unreasonably assumed that both writers were indebted to a lost work by Origen. Origen's exposition as given by Eusebius (Praep. evang., 6, 10, 74) is divergent. The words *in atomo* in Bede's quotation from I Corinthians are no doubt taken from Ambrose, who also cites this passage of Scripture. For this translation of the Vetus Latina, which is found also in Tertullian and Augustine, Jerome's Vulgate reads *in momento.*

The student of the earlier Middle Ages would fall into serious error if, in appraising the extent to which superstitions in general and those connected with the stars in particular had currency, he were to assume that such beliefs were confined to the uneducated masses. Rather it would be true to say that such notions were universally entertained; for what other conclusion is possible, when we find them among educated Churchmen from the fifth to the ninth century? Sidonius relates a curious tale of a murdered man whose fate was foretold by astrologers. After expressing disapproval of such superstition, he weakens and adds: 'it must be admitted that in the present case there was neither appearance of mere conjecture nor deliberate ambiguity; death enmeshed our reckless inquirer into the future exactly when and as it had been foretold; all his shifts to evade it were in vain.' [60] Gregory of Tours, who in his astronomical tract reprobates astrology, nevertheless in his History of the Franks mentions without disapproval many portents connected with the stars. We have just seen that Bede condemned astrology. Yet in a chapter headed De effectiva lunae potentia, he, like Basil and Ambrose before him, accepts certain superstitions regarding lunar influence on the growth of animals and plants and respecting the right and wrong time in the month to perform agricultural operations. Elsewhere he speaks of comets that portend a change of reign, pestilence, wars, or winds and tides.[61] Finally Servatus Lupus, the most cultured man of his age, perhaps with the passage of Bede in mind, wrote to his friend Altuin: [62]

De cometis qui visi sunt timendum quam disserendum videtur. Et quia de his nil usquam divina loquitur auctoritas, id opinari, immo metuere possumus quod gentiles illis apparentibus usu deprehenderunt. Hii portendere cometas pestilentiam vel famem vel bella tradiderunt.

Surely the significant words here are *timendum* and *metuere*, coupled with an acceptance of pagan notions. He goes on to

[60] Sidonius, Epist. (tr. Dalton), 8, 11, 9 ff.

[61] D. T. R., 28; D. N. R., 24. That the moon influences the growth of plants and animals is an opinion found in an agricultural writer like Palladius (cf. De la Ville de Mirmont, Rev. des études anciennes, 8 [1906], 155 ff.). Yet Palladius was one of the authors recommended by Cassiodorus to his monks (Inst., ed. Mynors, 72, 11).

[62] Lupus, Epist., 8 (ed. L. Levillain, I, 68).

quote Virgil, Josephus, and Justin, and his further remarks show that he was also scientifically interested in this comet, which is mentioned by other contemporary writers and which was visible in April, 837.[63]

The Carolingian Age

The ninth century was of crucial importance. In the main a knowledge of astrology, or rather of the commoner arguments against it, was still being disseminated through the wide use in monastic circles of three or four Patristic works. There is no doubt which was the most popular of all. The pseudo-Clementine Recognitions were easy to read and to assimilate. Apart from the fact that their Clementine authorship was not questioned, so that they enjoyed all the authority due to a book composed in the sub-Apostolic age, they contained a good, and at times exciting, story and they did not make the stern demands on their readers' intelligence that were called for by the more philosophical arguments of an Ambrose or an Augustine. The Recognitions were used by Aldhelm and Bede. They appear frequently in medieval library catalogues and are usually called there *S. Clementis liber* or *S. Clementis historia*, the title of the book being much more rarely given.[64] Extant manuscripts, moreover, are exceedingly numerous. E. C. Richardson listed no less than seventy-eight, but made no mention of codices in Einsiedeln, Tours, and Namur. And there are probably others, especially in the smaller uncatalogued collections.[65] More advanced students would become familiar with the argu-

[63] Another comet appeared in 842 and was visible for several months. Nithard (ed. Ph. Lauer, 108) relates that it could be seen at the time that Louis the German and Charles the Bald signed their famous pact.

[64] Cf. the index of G. Becker, Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui.

[65] See E. C. Richardson in A. von Harnack, Gesch. der altchrist. Literatur, I, 229 ff. The Einsiedeln manuscript (264) was copied partly in the ninth, partly in the tenth century (G. Meier, Cat. codd. mss. qui in bibl. mon. Einsidl. servantur and W. M. Lindsay, Notae latinae, 455). For Turonensis 267 (late 10th c.) see E. K. Rand, Manuscripts of Tours, I, no. 197 with Plate CLXXXVIII, 1, reproducing the end of Book 1 and the beginning of Book 2. For the Namur manuscript (Grand Séminaire, 37; 11th c.) see P. Faider, Catalogue des MSS. conservés à Namur, I, 462. This codex is in one respect unique; it alone preserves the early Latin version of I Clement. This was published by G. Morin in Anecdota Maredsolana, II, where a detailed description will be found (iii–v).

ments of Ambrose and Augustine. The popularity of the Hexameron and of the City of God needs no demonstration, but it is worth recalling to mind that, although the oldest manuscripts of the City of God are incomplete, one of the sixth century and one of the seventh contain Book V. In addition Hoffmann used one of the eighth and one of the ninth century. Similarly, Ambrose's commentary has survived in several manuscripts of the eighth and ninth centuries, besides many of later date, while the Orleans library still possesses a few folios of a codex copied in the seventh. Ambrosiaster's Quaestiones were evidently to be found in many libraries and extant manuscripts of the commentary on the Thirteen Epistles are numerous.[66]

There is, on the other hand, indubitable evidence for a slow revival of interest in 'scientific' astrology during the Carolingian Age. In proof of this one can point to a long letter by an anonymous author containing an astronomical discussion, but with definitely astrological additions.[67] Again, among the works wrongly attributed to Bede is a ninth century compilation which Charles Jones has called a 'brilliant exposition of the teaching of the rational school of the ninth century.'[68] The treatise is based on various earlier sources, as Jones has rightly stressed, but he has overlooked the fact that the addition of astrology and medicine to the four subjects of the *quadrivium* goes back to Isidore. And in the section entitled, De planetarum ordine et designatione, the unknown author has recourse to the Recognitions, as when he explains the evil influence of Mars and Saturn:[69]

[66] For his text of the revised version of the Quaestiones Souter used four MSS of the ninth, three of the tenth, and one of the thirteenth century, and there are others. But as his *stemma codicum* (CSEL, 50, xxxii) shows, these extant MSS presuppose many earlier ones now lost. The MSS of the commentary are listed in Souter's A study of Ambrosiaster, 14–16; but a definitive edition of this work is still to seek owing to the death of successive editors (cf. Souter's recent comment in Journ. Theol. Stud., 41 [1940], 304).

[67] Monum. Germ. Hist.: Epist., VI, 198, 36 ff.

[68] C. W. Jones, Bedae Pseudepigrapha, 83–84.

[69] Cf. Recogn. (PG, I, 1408A): *Denique cum Mars centrum tenens in domo sua ex tetragono respexerit Saturnum cum Mercurio ad centrum, luna veniente super eum plena, in genesi diurna, efficit homicidas et gladio casuros, sanguinarios, ebriosos,* etc. These passages and also Acta Sebast. (PL, 17, 1045) — *quod tempus tuum a malitioso Marte susceptum est aut Saturnus apocatasticus fuit* — may be added to the long list of examples, mostly from Greek writers, collected by A. D. Nock, Sallustius, lxxiii, note 54, to illustrate the malign activities of Mars and Saturn.

Mars positus in centro mundi, si Saturnum ex tetragono respexerit, si proximo loco post eum Mercurius cum plena luna idem tetigerit centrum, qui nascuntur in illa diurna genesi efficiuntur homicidae, gladio casuri, sanguinarii consilio vel facto, libidinosi, ebriosi, demoniosi, scrutatores secretorum, necromantici, malefici, sacrilegi, praecipue si nulla prospera impediverit.[70]

Furthermore, Van de Vyver has recently shown that the Latin versions of the so-called Letter of Petosiris and of the *ratio spherae Pythagoricae* were known already in the ninth century in important monastic centres, like Fleury, Chartres, and Corbie.[71] The astrological section in the Acta Sebastiani was also receiving a good deal of attention at this time. In the Scholica of Martin of Laon we find definitions of *apocatasticus*, *climacterica*, *diametrum*, *ephemeris*, *horoscopus*, *mathesis*, and *syndeton*, and in the case of three of these we are specifically told that the explanations given are those employed by the *mathematici*.[72] That some, if not all, of these definitions explain words in the Acta Sebastiani is made certain by comparison with some Glossae collectae contained in Ms. Vatic. lat. 1469 (Fol. 83r.–83v.) copied in 908. These glosses, as W. M. Lindsay has shown, presuppose a copy of the Acta with marginal annotations on such words as *diametrum*, *climacterica*, *synditus* (*sic*), *ephymeris* (*sic*), and *mathesis*.[73] That the commentator was not always entirely clear about his text is obvious from the following glosses:

mathesis centrum: id est disciplinalis punctus quo circulus volvitur
mathesis centrum: id est disciplinalis punctus circuli

The close relationship, however, between the Glossae and the Scholica is self evident.

The two authoritative presentations of 'scientific' astrology composed in Latin were the poem of Manilius and the treatise, Matheseos libri VIII, by Firmicus Maternus. No writer down

[70] PL, 90, 898A.

[71] A. Van de Vyver, Les plus anciennes traductions latines médiévales (Xe–XIe siècles) de traités d'astronomie et d'astrologie, in Osiris, I (1936), 658–691.

[72] M. L. W. Laistner, Bulletin of the J. Rylands Library, 7 (1923), 421–456. See A80, C12, D11, E13, H1, M3, S25. The alternative definition given for *ephemeris* — *annalis computatio continens seriem totius anni descriptam* — almost certainly refers, as Dr. Jones kindly informs me, to lists of solar and lunar letters, such as are frequently found in computistical manuscripts.

[73] W. M. Lindsay, Class. Quart., 15 (1921), 38–40.

to the end of the ninth century appears to show any acquaintance with either. In the medieval library catalogues Manilius appears but once, in a fifteenth century catalogue at Urbino. Firmicus' book, a copy of which may have existed in the tenth century at Regensburg, was to be found c. 1200 at St. Maur des Fossés and in Bamberg somewhat later; it is also recorded in three fifteenth and in one sixteenth century book-list.[74] Extant manuscripts of Firmicus are fairly numerous, but none is older than the eleventh century. Kroll and Skutsch, however, point out that the manuscripts of one group, though they go back to the same archetype as their main manuscripts (MVR), have been corrected by reference to other codices now lost. This second recension was already current in the eleventh century; the editors are, moreover, of the opinion that a manuscript existed in the Carolingian Age more complete than surviving manuscripts of the eleventh century. The end of Book 4 and Books 5 to 8 survive only in manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but their text, as Kroll and Skutsch believe, goes back ultimately to this Carolingian exemplar. The case of Manilius' poem is somewhat similar. No extant manuscript of it is earlier than the eleventh century and Housman has observed that the archetype need not have been older than the tenth. But he also admits the likelihood of the text having passed through an Insular stage.[75] Thus it is obvious that at least one manuscript of Manilius and only one of Maternus must have survived from pre-Carolingian times. Yet these authors had clearly been forgotten long since and only began to be rediscovered in the course of the ninth century.[76] But the multiplication of manuscripts was evidently very slow, and the

[74] For the solitary mention of Manilius cf. Max Manitius, HSS antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen, 72-73; for Firmicus Maternus, ibid., 172–173. The manuscript once at St. Maur des Fossés may be, according to Sittl, the extant codex, Paris. Bibl. nat. lat., 7311 (cf. W. Kroll and F. Skutsch in their edition of Firmicus, II, vii). Manitius assumed that the Regensburg manuscript was a copy of Firmicus. But is this certain, seeing that no author's name is given in the catalogue, but only the title, De creatione vel super mathesin?

[75] Manilius, ed. Housman, V, xviii.

[76] Or possibly in the eighth century. But if the Insular Manilius was copied in the British Isles, it need not have been older than the ninth, since the Insular script survived there long after it had disappeared on the continent in Insular centres.

absence of references to either Manilius or Firmicus in writers of the ninth century is also significant.

From the material which has been presented above certain conclusions would seem to emerge. The Latin-speaking West was acquainted with no book on 'scientific' astrology before the ninth or the tenth century. What little it did know about the subject was gleaned from a few Patristic works of small originality, in which were repeated arguments and illustrations that had become traditional in the course of centuries. Ambrosiaster alone diverged somewhat from the beaten track when he chose uncommon illustrations drawn from his own experience or from his varied reading. The attitude of the Church and of its leaders was indeed never in doubt. They tried constantly, but unsuccessfully, to root out all manner of superstitions of which popular astrology was one. Yet it would seem from the extant evidence that this was less of a menace to faith and morals than sorcery and other heathen practices. As for 'scientific' astrology, there is no adequate ground for asserting that it disappeared in the West because it was suppressed by authority. Had that been the case, some unambiguous proof of the fact would surely have survived. But the only clear example of official action was the attempted suppression not of astrologers as such, but of a heretic sect, one of whose heresies was believed to be an addiction to astrology. Not persecution or prosecution, but the lack of proper manuals caused the disappearance of 'scientific' astrology in the West for four or five centuries after Firmicus composed his astrologers' handbook.

SOLOMON STODDARD, 1643–1729

PERRY MILLER
Harvard University

The town of Northampton was settled in 1654, by pioneers coming up the valley from Connecticut. The physical tasks of the first years kept them from forming a church, but in 1659 they called Eleazar Mather to be their parson, who came with his bride Esther, daughter of the Reverend John Warham of Windsor. Mathers were either long or very short lived; Eleazar died on July 24, 1669, leaving Esther a widow of twenty-five, with three children and an estate of £524, of which £60 were in books, and Northampton went in search of a new pastor. In the forthright New England of the seventeenth century there was a method in such situations so frequently observed that it might almost be called a custom. When a minister died, after a town had invested in him to the extent of land and a house, and the widow was of marriageable age, they summoned a young bachelor to the pulpit. A few months after Eleazar's death, Solomon Stoddard, eight years out of Harvard, came by invitation to exhibit a sample of his preaching; on March 18, 1670, he married Esther Mather.[1] She bore him twelve children and in her old age, though very "lame of the Sciatica," she still was spinning "at the Linen-wheel"; [2] she outlived her husband by seven years and died in 1736 at the age of ninety-two.

The town fathers who made the three-day trip to Boston in 1669 to inspect the possibilities — which meant looking over all the then unemployed Harvard graduates — were astute men. Elder John Strong, born in Taunton, England, and William Clarke had both come with the Great Migration; Deacon Medad Pomery — whose name was probably pronounced as it was spelled, "Pumry" — was born in Windsor and had started life as a blacksmith, but he was already on the road to wealth, a merchant, town officer, associate justice of the county

[1] Unless otherwise noted, facts concerning Stoddard in Northampton are from James R. Trumbull, History of Northampton, Northampton, 1893.

[2] Samuel Sewall, Diary, III, 101 (Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., Ser. V, Vol. 7).

court, and after 1684 owner of the town monopoly on the sale of wine. These gentlemen never employed their talents to better advantage than when they picked Solomon Stoddard. The legend is that he was about to sail for England; if so, the story speaks for the kind of man he was, for few New England Puritans were deliberately putting their heads into the mouth of the Clarendon Code. They were rather, like Increase Mather, coming back to Massachusetts where careers and comforts were still to be had. Stoddard belonged, if anybody did, to the aristocracy of New England; he was one of the fifteen children of Anthony Stoddard, the merchant, and his mother, Mary Downing, was a niece of Governor Winthrop and sister to the versatile Sir George. He graduated from Harvard in 1662, maintaining as his commencement thesis the affirmative of "Utrum Deus puniat peccata necessitate naturae," [3] and for three years was librarian of the college, though he spent two of them at Barbadoes for his health. When he gave up his trip to Europe and went west, he knew what he was doing. Northampton was frontier, as far from Boston in 1669 as, let us say, Kansas might be today. It was a separate kingdom, beyond reach of the sceptre which Increase Mather was then beginning to wield. It was no place for a delicate scholar, but a man of action could make it a citadel. Stoddard was a man of magnificent action; he ruled the community by the sheer force of personality, and in his last years dominated the whole Connecticut valley. The biographer of Increase Mather rightly characterized him as "the foremost American Puritan," as he was on the international scene, but in New England Mather's hegemony was disputed and divided by Solomon Stoddard. Timothy Dwight said that Stoddard "possessed, probably, more influence than any other Clergyman in the province"; [4] by those who had smarted under his power he was known as "Pope Stoddard," and even the Indians went in awe of him, for the story goes that once during Queen Anne's war as he was pacing in meditation

[3] John L. Sibley, Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University, II (1881), 101.

[4] Travels in New-England and New York, New Haven (1821–22), I, 331; also quoted in Trumbull, History of Northampton, II, 54.

by "Dewey's Hole" on the road to Hatfield, he passed an ambush and a Frenchman took aim, but an Indian knocked the gun aside, saying there went the Englishman's God.

A great part of Stoddard's story is simply that of the typical country parson, the ambassador of culture and sound doctrine to a hard-working frontier. The town voted him a salary of £100 and within a few years gave him an extra £100 and twenty acres for a house; he kept the money and the land, and lived for twelve years in Esther's house before he built one of his own. The children came with regularity, as did the measles.[5] He and Joseph Parsons were granted twenty acres on which to build a sawmill, from which they made a few pennies, though Stoddard sold out in 1689, and his sermons frequently denounced ministers who ventured into business. In every town there were difficulties about collecting the minister's salary; in 1693 Ensign Timothy Baker and Deacon Pomery were appointed to see that Stoddard got his due; in 1697 he offered to be content with £80 in cash instead of £100 in "country pay," and the town promptly accepted; in 1715 it gave him a bonus of £60 and raised his salary again to £100 in money. He took the lead in all civic enterprises, and was chiefly responsible for a public works project that constructed a road to Boston wide enough for wheeled vehicles. If his health had been frail in the 1660's, it must have mended marvellously in the valley. He never missed a Sabbath or a lecture for fifty-nine years, except when he was making his annual visit to Boston.

> He preach'd with strength of Voice and Memory,
> Near Sixty Years, and not a Note at's Eye.[6]

A former servant of a Boston gentleman, being troubled in his conscience because he had cheated his master of a bushel and a half of wheat, brought the money to Solomon Stoddard, who sent it to Boston with the authoritative injunction, "I doubt

[5] Cf. letter of Warham Mather, Stoddard's step-son, to his uncle, Increase Mather, July 6, 1688: "My father's family is in health, after their affliction by the meazels. God hath added to our sisters by a 9th, Hannah by name" (Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., Ser. IV, Vol. 8, 671).

[6] Joseph Nash, An Elegy Upon the much Lamented Decease of the Reverend & Excellent Mr. Solomon Stoddard [1729].

not but you will be ready to passe by his offence & beg forgiveness of his sin from God." [7] Five of his daughters married parsons, and one of them bore Timothy Edwards ten daughters and a pale son whom they named Jonathan. Stoddard's estate was inventoried at £1126 exclusive of his library, which numbered 462 volumes and 491 pamphlets. He also possessed ten knives and nine forks.

Yet typical as this life was in some respects, it did not fall entirely into the pattern of the rural parson's, at least not into the genial tempo of eastern Massachusetts. Stoddard was on the frontier, and in perilous times. He told the town that without the power and grace treasured up in Jesus Christ he could not accept the call, but he was certain that when we have the command of God for our warrant, "we have his promise both for assistance and pardon," and in God's name he resolved to give "the residue of my dayes to the service of the house of God in this place." In 1675 broke out King Philip's war, in which the male population of New England was literally decimated. Stoddard was the first to get wind of the conspiracy and wrote warnings to Boston that were not heeded in time; he was in the thick of the campaigns and influenced their conduct. The magistrates in 1676 contemplated abandoning the Connecticut valley, but Stoddard sent them a stinging letter in the name of the community, protesting that "we dare not entertain any thoughts of deserting this plantation"; he based their resolution first upon the testimony of the Lord, who "has wounderfully appeared of late for our preservation, & we feare it would be displeasing unto him, if we should give up into the hands of our enemies, by running away, that which the Lord has so eminently delivered out of their hands," and, second, upon the argument that to abandon Northampton would be an unwise military maneuver. He and his townsmen subscribed this letter, "Your humble servants"! After the war he petitioned the General Court for £20 because he had "sustained considerable loss in proportion to my estate" and it would "not answer my occasions to have it paid little by little out of the rates of the town." If the Indians accorded him an involuntary

[7] MS., Massachusetts Historical Society.

reverence, he did not return the compliment. His step-daughter married John Williams at Deerfield, and in 1703 the Indians killed two young men there; again sensing danger, Stoddard wrote to Governor Dudley that the only way to handle these varmints was to train big dogs to hunt them down. "The dogs would be an extream terror to the Indians: they are not much afraid of us, they know, they can take us & leave us"; of course, if the Indians "did manage their warr fairly after the manner of other nations," this would be an inhumane device, but Stoddard, the frontier parson, knew that the only good Indian was a dead one: "they are to be looked upon as theives & murderers, they doe acts of hostility, without proclaiming war . . . they act like wolves & are to be dealt withall as wolves." In characteristic vein he concluded, "your Excellency will not take it amisse that I take my accustomed freedome, & am so officious as to tender my advice before it be asked." [8] The governor finally acted upon his suggestion, in 1706, but too late to save Eunice Williams at Deerfield, whose pitiable death is recorded in her husband's The Redeemed Captive.

The revolution that Stoddard wrought in New England was a product of his character and his background. He was spokesman for the frontier, for the Connecticut valley, against Boston and Cambridge. In 1685 he sent the manuscript of his first book to his "brother" Increase Mather, asking him to write an epistle to it, explaining, "I live in a remote corner & am much unknown." [9] But he was no country boor, bowing and scraping before the great man of the metropolis. On the contrary, during the war he told brother Mather that the real cause of their afflictions was "that intolerable pride in clothes and hair; the toleration of so many taverns especially in Boston, and suffering home dwellers to lie tippling in them." In great part through his insistence, the General Court passed a series of sumptuary laws, but even Pope Stoddard was not able to exorcise the feminine lust for finery. Twenty-three persons were presented in Northampton on March 27, 1676, "for wearing silk in a flaunting manner and for long hair, and other ex-

[8] MHS Coll., Ser. IV, Vol. 2, 235–37.

[9] MS., Oct. 19, 1685, Massachusetts Historical Society.

travagances contrary to honest and sober order, and demeanor not becoming a wilderness state, at least the profession of Christianity and religion." Two of these were daughters of Elder Strong, and one sad wretch, Hannah Lyman, was so hardened in iniquity that she wore her silk dress to the trial and was fined ten shillings. But if the sins of Northampton were grievous, they were nothing as compared with Boston's, for there, in 1677, a Baptist minister was openly preaching: "I fear it will be a meanes to fill that Town, which is allready full of unstable persons, with error." [10] The eternal voice of the provinces upon the profligacy of the capital!

Such then was Solomon Stoddard, a tall, strong man of passion and of frank speaking. One Joseph Nash thus portrayed him in what was intended to be verse: [11]

> His venerable Looks let us descry
> He taller was than mean or common size,
> Of lovely Look, with majesty in's Eyes.
> From Nature's Gate he walk'd like King's on Earth
> There's scarce such Presence seen 'mongst humane breath.

When a Synod met at Boston in 1679 to take thought about the moral declension of New England, a venerable lay delegate from Medway, Mr. Wheelock, said there "was a cry of injustice" because ministers were not "rated," and Stoddard called him a liar. That night Mr. Wheelock went to Stoddard and begged his forgiveness but, according to Peter Thacher, "Mr. Stodder was high." The next day the good Wheelock abased himself by confessing to the Synod that he had spoken in heat and asked their pardon: "Mr. Stodder," says Peter Thacher, "did something thô very little" by him.[12] Every year at commencement time, Stoddard covered the road to Boston that he had caused to be constructed, and he generally gave the Thursday lecture. In 1707, after attending the Harvard ceremony — which by that time had come to be something of a county fair [13] — he preached the lecture from Micah 1. 5, and, says Samuel

[10] MHS Coll., Ser. IV, Vol. 8, 586–87.

[11] Nash, Elegy.

[12] Williston Walker, The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, 1893, pp. 418–19.

[13] Cf. S. E. Morison, Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century, 1936, II, 465 ff.

Sewall, spoke *plainly* (Sewall underlines the plainly) "in Several Articles against Superstition. Spake against excess in Comencem't entertainments." [14] Sewall was a life-long friend of Stoddard's, and frequently sent back with him a piece of "Comencment Cake," two or three pounds of "Reasons" and almonds "in a paper bag," or "two half pounds of Chockalat" for Madame Stoddard,[15] but on this Thursday night Stoddard, accompanied by the Governor, came to Sewall's house and roundly told him that as a magistrate he ought to restrain the sinful profusion at Cambridge. Their friendship could stand such outbursts, and when Sewall was in grief, in 1717, he was "refreshed" with a letter of condolence from Northampton: "I soked it in Tears at reading." [16] By 1721 Stoddard was no longer able to ride to Cambridge, but he remembered his friends in Boston, he wrote to Sewall, "and am a Well-Willer to them, and particularly to your self." [17] In 1728 Sewall learned "that although you continue your Ministerial Labours on the Sabbath and Lecture, which is wonderfull, yet now it is with much pain; and you hardly expect to live out the winter." Sewall congratulated him on "the unparalleld constancy of Serviceableness, which God has honoured you with, and the Blessings granted you in the Serviceableness of your Children and Grandchildren"; when the time comes, he continued, "I hope you will be enabled joyfully to pronounce Simeon's Nunc dimittis. 'Tis more accurately expresed in the Greek, than in our Translation. I pray you turn to it, for I cannot tell how to write it." But Sewall, in the midst of his learning and resignation, could not resist describing the death of his physician, Dr. John Clark, and he concluded cheerfully, "I have buried very many noble Physicians." [18]

That Stoddard was something more than a country minister hidden away in a western town was symbolized by his trips to the Harvard commencements. In Boston, said Benjamin Colman, "both Ministers and People receiv'd his *annual Visits*

[14] Sewall, Diary, II, 190–91 (MHS Coll., Ser. V, Vol. 6).
[15] Ibid., p. 192.
[16] Ibid., Vol. III, 153.
[17] MHS Coll., Ser. VI, Vol. 2, 131.
[18] Ibid., pp. 259–60.

with a peculiar Reverence and Pleasure," [19] and Joseph Nash singled out these occasions for particular celebration:

> The Learn'd him priz'd, as one in Wisdom bright,
> And much at his they did their Candles light.
> In's annual Visits to our Center Town,
> He Lectures preach'd; and there had in great renown.
> He much a Primate and a Prince among
> The Learn'd, who joy'd to hear his annual Song.[20]

This, however, was written after the tumult of the battle had died, and even Increase Mather had cried enough. At the turn of the century the learned who lighted their candles at Mather's were neither so reverent nor pleased at his invasions, but they could not keep him out, for there were as many, if not more, who carried a torch which Solomon Stoddard had set ablaze.

Man of action though he was, Stoddard was also an intellect. The obituary in the Boston News Letter described him as furnished with learning, well skilled in the languages, and above all, "well vers'd in the religious Controversies that relate either to Points of Doctrine or Church Government." [21] If Stoddard is at all remembered today, except as the grandfather of Jonathan Edwards, it is for his reforms in church government, but his contemporaries regarded his contribution to doctrine as of equal importance. His greatest book was the manuscript he sent in 1685 to Increase Mather, asking him to write a foreword: "it may be a few words from your selfe may gain it the greater acceptance." [22] It received no commendation from Increase Mather, and was published on its merits in 1687; when Benjamin Colman preached on Stoddard's death he said, "among the worthy *Remains* of his Learning and Ministry in Print, the *Mantle* he has left to us, his Safety of appearing in the Righteousness of Christ outshines all the rest." [23] It was one of the most widely read books in all New England for sixty years; reissued in 1729, it was especially popular during the

[19] Benjamin Colman, The Faithful Ministers of Christ mindful of their own Death, Boston, 1729, p. 2.

[20] Nash, Elegy.

[21] Boston Weekly News Letter, Feb. 20, 1729 (quoted in Trumbull, History of Northampton, II, 62).

[22] MS., Massachusetts Historical Society.

[23] Colman, The Faithful Minister, p. 24.

Great Awakening. In American intellectual history it should be rated along with a few books of Cotton Mather's and Wises' Vindication as one of the bridges by which New England passed from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century. Stoddard reiterated and supplemented it in several publications, but the heart of his theology was succinctly and decisively stated in The Safety of Appearing. There can be little doubt, even though there is no positive proof, that for this very reason Increase Mather would not touch it. Indeed, the book comes closer than any other work in seventeenth century New England to being "original."

At first sight this estimate may seem gross exaggeration, for the volume purports to be merely another exposition of the theology that had been domesticated in New England from the beginning, of the "federal" or "covenant" system, which the founders, even before they came to America, had believed was the only right reading of the Bible. However, this book was influential not because it broke with tradition, but precisely because, while remaining within the tradition, it developed doctrine in a fashion that responded to the deepest necessities of the age. His assumptions were of the past, but his deductions, or rather his emphases, opened a door to the future just at a moment when the New England mind was suffocating within the rigid confines of a theology it had outgrown.

The federal theologians held that men not merely are elected by God and not merely regenerated by infused grace, but at the moment of their calling enter into a covenant with God, promising to obey His will, while He in turn contracts to give them perseverance and salvation. As Stoddard explains in The Safety of Appearing, it has been God's manner ever since the creation to deal with man "in the way of a *Covenant*, to that end that men may be encouraged to walk in the right way to the obtaining of good." [24] With Adam God made the "*Covenant of Works*," whereby, as Stoddard puts it, Adam "was constituted a legal head, or representative of his posterity, to act in our behalf; to stand or fall for us, as well as himself." [25]

[24] The Safety of Appearing at the Day of Judgment, 2nd ed., Boston, 1729, p. 164.

[25] Ibid., p. 31

When Adam failed, his sin was "imputed" to his posterity, and original sin was rationally explicable as a legal transference from the representative to the constituency. Had God not "tied his own hands" by the Covenant, He could have forgiven Adam out of His plenary power, but "God had so bound himself by *his Law* that men could not be saved without *satisfaction*; that mercy must be purchased." [26] Hence, God devised the Covenant of Grace, which Stoddard and the covenant theologians openly hailed as a "contrivance" — "not the invention of man; a thing plotted and devised by any finite understanding, but the contrivance of God himself." [27] In this Covenant, God offers to undertake His own satisfaction in the person of Christ, and requires of man no longer that he fulfill the law but that he believe in the Saviour. To those who believe, God promises infallible salvation. "*God engages himself by promise to give believers eternal life.* He . . . binds himself by his *promise*. . . . God is bound by Covenant to give life unto believers." [28] Federal divines insisted that in order to believe a man must receive grace, so that the covenant doctrine was still essentially Calvinist and predestinarian; but it gained a solid and rational basis for the divine decrees. By proposing explicit terms, God is dealing with men as "rational creatures." God "never left mankind to guess at the way of salvation"; His "manner is to propose conditions to men, and give them assurance of the benefit in that way." [29] Consequently men may know where they stand: "God tells us upon what *terms* we shall have life; he has stated the *method* wherein he will bestow mercy." [30] One of the principal aims of the doctrine had obviously been to provide safe and certain grounds for assurance; when it was invented men were overwhelmed by the sense of a transcendent and omnipotent divinity, and it erected a platform on which the saint might stand secure, though it had to build that refuge upon the pledged word of God. "We need no greater assurance of salvation than the promise of God," wrote Stoddard: "this is a sufficient security to believers, whatever unlikelihoods may appear to them at any time, of their salva-

[26] The Safety of Appearing, p. 68.
[27] Ibid., p. 226.
[28] Ibid., p. 80.
[29] Ibid., p. 164.
[30] Ibid., p. 223.

tion." When the almighty and incalculable force that governed the universe could be captured within the stated bonds of a covenant, "this is a foundation of everlasting comfort." [31]

All this by 1687 was conventional and familiar. But Stoddard's formulation is novel not for his doctrine but for his implications. It contrasts with the contemporaneous treatments, first of all because it insists more passionately upon the absolute, naked will of God behind the Covenant. The federal theologians had developed the notion that a God who agreed to reasonable terms was inherently rational; Stoddard on the contrary said that this "contrivance" rested upon nothing but the mere pleasure of an absolute monarch, upon His free determination and not upon any inherent rationality. Samuel Willard summarized the federalist theory when he declared, "we conceive of God's decrees in a rational way . . . because else we could entertain no conceptions at all about this glorious mystery"; [32] Stoddard was acutely aware of the glorious mystery that transcends the categories of reason. He found carnal reason always suggesting "that other ways are more probable; . . . carnal reason is full of objections against the Doctrine of our acceptance by Christ's righteousness." [33] Hence he would not allow the covenant to be based on anything but God's pleasure; not upon reason but upon decree, not upon justice but appointment. "The *only reason* why God sets his love on one man and not upon another is, *because he pleases*"; God acts arbitrarily, as the potter in forming his vessels: "The will of God is sufficient to move him to choose one and refuse another." [34] The Covenant does not flow necessarily from the mercy of God, "but he exercises grace freely from His Sovereign Will and Pleasure." He would still be infinite in mercy "if it had pleased him never to exercise any." [35]

This much, too, might almost be paralleled in other writers. The federal theology was always conscious that the Covenant rested, in the ultimate analysis, upon the will of God, and pro-

[31] Ibid., p. 87.

[32] Samuel Willard, A Compleat Body of Divinity, Boston, 1726, p. 255.

[33] The Safety of Appearing, p. 3.

[34] Ibid., p. 274.

[35] Ibid., p. 13.

fessed to remember that behind revelation there lurked the "hidden" God who could not be confined in any comprehensible terms. But the federal theology usually sought to minimize this awareness by teaching Christians that they had to deal with God only according to the explicit and rational terms of the Covenant. Stoddard went behind the theology to revivify the fading sense of a hidden and uncircumscribed power. And with what startling results! The original federalists extracted from the doctrine a method for proving in this world the identity of the saints; a man in the covenant was one of the elect, ergo saints could be distinguished from sinners and the churches of New England could be limited to those assured of their salvation. But Stoddard's conclusion was precisely the opposite: because the Covenant is dispensed by an arbitrary and unpredictable divinity, because it definitely is *not* reasonable, it is open to all and no man can tell who is really a saint. The individual may have an inner conviction of grace, but there is no objective standard for measuring it. Conversion is a reality, but it "cannot be made evident by experience to the world, because the world cannot certainly know." [36] Since it is impossible to tell who is a true saint, all should strive to be the best they can. "The *meer pleasure* of God does decide it, who shall be the objects of his *love* and his *hatred*. You have no reason to be discouraged because you can find *no reason* in *your self* of God's love." There is a probability that the child of godly parents, brought up under the means, will be regenerated, but only a probability, and anyone is as capable as he: "the free will of God is the only thing that does determine it; and therefore you have sufficient ground of encouragement to accept the offer of salvation." [37] Where New England from the beginning had been concerned with testing the evidences of election and tabulating external manifestations, Stoddard exhibited a fervor for bringing all men before God in the hope that all might be saved. He turned away from calculation, hereditary interest, formal logic, to zeal and piety. Precisely because the Covenant is an arbitrary appointment, and precisely because men cannot tell who are actually redeemed, all

[36] The Safety of Appearing, p. 109.

[37] Ibid., p. 275.

men should feel that it is "safe" for them to come to God. This was his title, The Safety of Appearing at the Day of Judgment, in the Righteousness of Christ. "We may safely venture our souls upon his word. God assures us that it is so, and gives a large account in his word how the thing is brought about." [38] A Christian may not know all the subtleties of theology, but he need not worry: he knows what "will satisfy his heart that it is sufficient: namely, that God gives this testimony to it, and invites him to venture upon it." [39]

Venture upon it! Venture upon what? Upon approaching to God, to His word — did this mean to His sacraments? "The call is to *every one that will.* . . . So that they that are at a loss about their present condition, have free liberty to come as well as others." God requires no more than acceptance, "so that there is no bar in any man's way." [40] At this point Increase and Cotton Mather, Samuel Willard, and most of the clergy of eastern New England sniffed the taint of heresy. Not only would Increase write no foreword to this book, but he would combat it tooth and nail.

To understand why this reversal of the conventional theological emphasis was so ominous, we have to remember the state of the colonial churches at the end of the seventeenth century. When Solomon Stoddard went to Northampton, New England was torn apart over the issue of the Half-Way Covenant.[41] This bitter controversy arose not out of the original theory but out of the behavior of the second and, still more, of the third generations. The children, and then the grandchildren, of the first members were growing up in America to be good enough citizens, moral, conscientious, even earnest, but few of them were experiencing what the founders had known so well, the intense ecstasy of regeneration. The children had been baptised, in accordance with Congregational theory, on the strength of their fathers' covenant, but they came of age without the strength to repeat their fathers' profession. By 1662 the ques-

[38] Ibid., p. 260; cf. pp. 20–52.

[39] Ibid., p. 103.

[40] Ibid., pp. 279–80.

[41] Perry Miller, "The Half-Way Covenant," New Eng. Quar., 6 (1933), 670–715; Williston Walker, Creeds and Platforms, pp. 244–87.

tion had become so urgent that the ministers met in a Synod to decide what should be done with these children. Should they be turned out of the church as so many reprobates, or could they be regarded in some sense as members? By an overwhelming majority, the Synod decided to count them in, on the basis of a "Half-Way" Covenant, which meant that although they had no marked experience of grace they could nevertheless be numbered among the elect as long as they were not openly "scandalous." Though they could not make a profession of living faith, they could, when they came of age, at least "own the covenant" of their baptism, and in turn present their children. Thus the generations would be kept within the churches and be subjected to discipline. Otherwise, the ministers could foresee, the churches would dwindle to a small remnant of the saints, who would soon be overwhelmed by the excluded hordes. To save their precious system, they compromised, and by astute management, vigorous propaganda, and infinite patience they converted most of the congregations.

Yet it took much doing. The incredible fact is that the leaders and not the people put through the amendment, and that it took the clergy thirty years or more to persuade their flocks. Reasons for the lay opposition are not far to seek: the people had been taught that the essence of the "New England Way" — which was a perfect imitation of the Apostles' way — was the regenerate membership, and that regeneration was an ascertainable experience which could be tested. Hence no one could take up the covenant of a true church unless he had first been admitted to the Covenant of Grace and could prove that he had become a "visible saint"; no one could celebrate the Supper of the Lord unless he could first give an account of a work of grace and make a profession of faith. Having been told this, and believing it, the people were ready to stand by it, even though their teachers were now endeavoring to convince them that their own children might be members of a sort without having known a true conversion.

There can be no doubt about the motives of the clergy. They were candor itself. Unless the posterity are under the wings of the covenant, said John Allin, they will be left "at a loose end

without the Discipline of Christ, the Means to prevent sin, or to reduce them to Repentance unto life." [42] Jonathan Mitchell argued with the opponents, "It is easie to see that in the way your self and some others go, *the bigger half of the people in this Country will in a little Time be unbaptized.*" [43] Increase Mather at first joined the small band of ministers who disagreed with the Synod, but he came round after he had time to perceive that, the children being left alone and becoming numerous, "it is now . . . become a difficulty (*and almost an Impossibility*) how to bring them under the yoke of Christ." [44] He expunged from his memory all recollection of his opposition, and brought up Cotton to believe that the Half-Way Covenant had been a sacred tenet of New England from the beginning. Yet however practical their motive, the advocates did have plausible grounds in the Covenant theology for their position. Congregationalism was a direct consequence of this theology; the church covenant was a public registration of the internal covenant, and institutionalized the Covenant of Grace. As in the covenant with Abraham God had included the "seed" of the saint, so He did likewise in the Covenant of Grace and in its visible counterpart, the covenant of the church. On this basis alone New Englanders baptised the children of members — and only the children of members — not because baptism would "beget" faith in them but because it would increase the faith they already had.[45] They were included from birth among the elect; therefore their baptism was a "seal" upon the grace that was already theirs. When they grew up and made a profession, they would only be bringing to utterance what was always in their hearts; however, if they grew up without making one, they could still be viewed as in the Covenant of Grace because God had so promised their fathers. By the same token, the as-

[42] John Allin, Animadversions upon the Antisynodalia Americana, Cambridge, 1664, p. 6.

[43] Quoted in Increase Mather, The First Principles of New-England, Concerning the Subject of Baptisme & Communion of Churches, Cambridge, 1675, Postscript, p. 5.

[44] Increase Mather, A Discourse Concerning the Subject of Baptisme, Cambridge, 1675, pp. 31–32.

[45] Miller, "Puritan Theory of the Sacraments," Catholic Historical Review, 22 (1937), 409–25.

sumption could be extended to their children, and so on down the generations.

This much was logic itself, but logic has its limits, even among Puritans. It could demonstrate that lukewarm children were legally church members, but it could not make them the kind of members required for a true church. It could not prove them surely regenerate, and the essence of a covenanted church was still a regenerate body. Therefore, though the Synod would account nonscandalous children among the putative saints, it could not permit them to come to the Lord's Supper. The advocates had no intention of allowing half-way members to sit down content with their dubious status. The baptised were informed that they were bound by their baptismal covenant to work and pray for grace, to make a profession and proceed to full membership. They were not heathens who must wait for God to call them; they were under the constraint of a specific contract. God had appointed both the sacraments not to engender faith but to seal it. Baptism sealed the faith attributed to the child through his father's covenant, but before he could receive the Lord's Supper he had to offer solid evidence that he had a faith of his own. The principal author of the Half-Way Covenant, Jonathan Mitchell, advised against "Rigid *Severity*" in admissions to the second sacrament, but he also was positive that baptism of the children should never give rise to laxity: "to admit all sorts to full Communion, or upon very slight *Qualifications*, is against the Principles and against the Interest of *Reformation*." [46] Thomas Shepard, Jr., preached in 1672: "Let the Scripturally-unworthy be debarred the holy things in the Sacrament, *&c.* which they have no right unto by Rule. . . . Though they bounce at the door, yet let them not have it opened to them, till duely qualified for the same." [47] Increase and Cotton Mather were copiously explicit on this point: the half-way members were in the church, and upon owning their covenant they could offer their children to bap-

[46] Jonathan Mitchell, Nehemiah on the Wall in Troublesome Times (preached 1667), Cambridge, 1671, pp. 28–29.

[47] Thomas Shepard, Eye-Salve, Or a Watch-Word From our Lord Iesus Christ unto his Churches, Cambridge, 1673, p. 46 [misnumbered 38].

tism, but none could approach the table until they had made a spontaneous profession before the congregation. Otherwise there would be a tragic end to the New England Way, the founders would be betrayed, and the Reformation undone.

The result was, by the end of the century, that every community was divided not into two but into three divisions. There was a small body of visible and professing saints who were the "church," a larger circle of half-way members who made up the "congregation," and the rest, the as yet unconverted children of the unconverted, constituted the "town." In theory the lines that separated these groups were precise. As New England had held from the beginning, its outward order embodied an inner reality, and the threefold division corresponded with spiritual differences no less objective than the twofold discrimination between saints and sinners. But in practice, the distinctions rapidly came to seem less clear. Many professors proved guilty of notorious crimes,[48] while the half-way children showed a lamentable disposition to rest supinely satisfied with what they had. As they became more "formal," they became indistinguishable from the townsmen; their only merit was descent from saintly grandparents or even great-grandparents. The ministers were sadly compelled to acknowledge that "Saving Grace is not absolutely tied to the visible covenant," that membership was not the same thing as regeneration, because too many members obviously were not true Christians: "So that being in the Covenant and under the terms of it, doth . . . not make an infallible truth that such an one must & shall be Saved." [49] The Half-Way Covenant, in spite of the ingenious arguments of its authors, was proving a fatal surrender of the federalist tenet that the inner and outer covenants could be perfectly identified and that ecclesiastical matter was forever to be moulded by spiritual form. The children were retained on the basis of probability, not of fact; if probability was enough, why need they attempt more, once they received baptism? They were in the Covenant, at least "foederally" as

[48] Cf. Cotton Mather, Things for a Distress'd People to think upon, 1696, pp. 18–21; Terribilia Dei, 1697, pp. 51–52; Magnalia (1853–55), II, 493.

[49] Samuel Willard, The Movrners Cordial, 1691, p. 76.

the word was, and what could anyone know about the inscrutable reality locked up in the counsels of God? The Synod of 1662 endeavored manfully to preserve the original vision by requiring an active profession from those who would come to the Lord's Supper, but after a time the preachers were declaring, "we may not believe, that all outward Worshippers are inwardly sincere." [50] The best judgment we can form concerning anyone's spiritual condition, said Willard in 1700, is "negative": "we are not to conclude men to be in a state of sin . . . and yet we cannot be without some fears or jealousies about them, when we see little or nothing positively to encourage us." [51]

If there were reasons before 1684 why the clergy in New England should strive to keep the people under church discipline, in Massachusetts there were still more urgent incentives when the political control was taken from the hands of the saints. After the new charter, the leaders saw all too clearly that the future of the churches depended upon themselves. Their only hope was a succession of communicating children. An Anglican or Presbyterian system could get along comfortably with such limited support as the charter now permitted the Congregational order, for all the populace would still have been members and would have remained amenable to ecclesiastical censures. But a Congregational system must have holy members. As soon as Andros was ousted, the ministers started a concerted campaign to press upon half-way members their obligation to become full members. In 1692 Cotton Mather drew up a short list of the dangers threatening the system, which by implication contained the program for a Puritan orthodoxy under a royal charter: "*Church Fellowship* is neglected; a Gospel *Ministry* is not supported; a Gospel *Discipline* is not affected; the *Baptism* of the Lord is not Improved; and the *Supper* of the Lord is not Approached." [52] Thanks to the clauses which Increase Mather had written into the charter, the government could enforce support of the ministry, but it could do no more.

[50] Joshua Moody, The Great Sin of Formality in God's Worship, 1691, p. 24.

[51] Willard, The Peril of the Times, 1700, pp. 64–65.

[52] Cotton Mather, Fair Weather, 1692, p. 3.

By every means available, the ministers had to force the baptised to "improve" their obligation; they had to drive them to the Supper of the Lord, or else the churches would perish. Hundreds of sermons hammered the point home: "That Covenant which Believers have entred into with the blessed Holy God has been Confirmed and Sealed in their Baptism, which brings under a further Obligation unto holy Obedience"; God offers salvation to those that come up to the terms of the Covenant of Grace, "But they that notwithstanding their being Baptised do not what the Covenant ingageth them unto, are guilty of Violating the Sacred and Dreadful Obligation which their Baptism has brought upon them." [53] To the fullest extent permissible in a theology of divine determinism — and the federal doctrine made possible some startling extensions — the ministers urged action upon their people and threatened them with dire consequences if they did not bestir themselves.

The ministers exhorted and denounced and prayed, and year by year their wail increased, "Yea how many Baptized persons (come to years) live as if they had no sense of their Baptismal ingagement to be the Lords?" [54] Twenty years after Shepard denied admission to unqualified applicants though they bounced at the door, the only concern was that they should show signs of bouncing. The ministers might stretch their Calvinism to the breaking point, but they could bring no man to the communion who did not come of his own volition. The heart and soul of the New England experiment was the concept of a holy freedom; no man could commune with God except he did it willingly, and no man could will to commune unless he had the grace of God. Distinctions between the saints and the reprobates might be hopelessly muddled in daily life, nevertheless a wide gulf lay between them, and the New England churches did not dare to forget it. Whatever the practical difficulties of recognition, conversion was a definite, tangible experience, the rock upon which the churches were founded. Ministers might plead and berate, exert pressures and invent stratagems, lower

[53] Increase Mather, Practical Truth's, Tending to Promote Holiness (1st ed., 1682), 1704, pp. 39–40.

[54] Peter Thacher, Unbelief Detected and Condemned, 1708, p. 35.

the bars and give doubtful candidates the benefit of every doubt, but as long as they were faithful to the founders, they could admit only those who voluntarily professed faith and repentance. These churches were founded upon covenants, not upon administrative appointments; they could come into being only by the consent of regenerate men, and the Lord's Supper could be offered therein only to those who, by the grace of God, were able to swear to the covenant. As the communicants fell off to a corporal's guard, the need for professions among the half-way members became desperate, but there were limits to what a New England parson could do. He could beg the baptised children to come to the Supper and menace them with perdition if they did not; he could blame them "for the paucity of them that are in Fellowship with us at the Holy Table," and explain that the continuation of the churches depended "on the Addition of Members out of the Families already *incorporated* thereinto," not upon "such as are *Occasionally* converted in them," [55] but on the other hand he was compelled to tell them that they had to have a clear evidence of election before they presumed to approach the table. Otherwise they profaned the ordinance and drank damnation to themselves. In 1690 Cotton Mather was scourging the congregations thus: "Do not think now to mock the God of Heaven, by something that Looks like a *Renewal* of your *baptismal Covenant*, without seeking the *Supper* of the Lord"; [56] at the same time, he was telling them that if a man came unworthily, though he honestly believed himself converted, "for this man to be now misled by a false Assurance, *This* undoes him Totally, Finally, and very Terribly." [57] The children were informed in one breath, "you have Covenanted with the Lord, confirmed it by seales, remember what you have done," [58] and in the next, "Unworthy partaking at the Supper of the Lord hath been the procuring cause of Sickness and death among us." [59] A genera-

[55] Cotton Mather, A Companion for Communicants, 1690, pp. 79–80.

[56] Ibid., p. 68.

[57] Ibid., p. 92.

[58] Hancock MS., Harvard College Library, p. 95.

[59] John Allin, on November 3, in MS. Sermons, Sept. 19–Dec. 15, 1689, Harvard College Library.

tion after the Half-Way Covenant was devised, this was the dilemma the majority of members confronted: "It is a sin to *come unworthily* to, but it is also a sin to *stay unworthily* from, that Blessed Ordinance," [60] but the distinction between holiness and depravity was so blurred that they were unable to discover their own worth or lack of it. They were damned if they came, they were damned if they did not. What wonder that even ministers prayed in anxiety, "Lord, lead me through this Labyrinth," [61] or that despite all their efforts, they should be forced to confess, "yet how many in our Congregations, do turn their backs upon this Ordinance when it is to be administered?" [62]

Did Solomon Stoddard foresee this result from the beginning, or did he perceive it taking shape only after a short experience at Northampton? Was he secretly a rebel against the New England way even at Harvard College, or did he realize its defects from the vantage point of the frontier? Did he take up another course for sheer rivalry of Increase Mather or out of the deep convictions of his soul? What intellectual sources contributed to his thinking, or did he evolve his ideas merely out of the New England background? All we know is this: Eleazar Mather, like his brother Increase, was a stout opponent of the Half-Way Covenant in 1662, though their father, Richard, was one of its defenders; but Northampton, unlike most towns, wanted it, and the usual situation was here reversed. The people were both dutiful and resolute; Eleazar kept them from adopting it for seven years, but in 1669 they voted for it without his concurrence.[63] Six months later, just as Increase was going over to the enemy, Eleazar died. The town held off until the new minister was chosen, but its sympathies were made clear in 1669–70 when the deputies from Northampton sided with the Half-Way Covenant party in the dispute that grew out of the secession of the Third Church of Boston from the First, a conflict that produced a political upset in the General Court

[60] Cotton Mather, A Companion for Communicants, p. 78.

[61] Samuel Willard, Some Brief Sacramental Meditations (1st ed., 1711), 1743, pp. 41 ff.

[62] Peter Thacher, Unbelief Detected, p. 41.

[63] Trumbull, History of Northampton, I, 201–02, 213.

and marked the height of the agitation.[64] As soon as Stoddard was settled, the church put the Half-Way Covenant into practice; provision was made that those not scandalous and willing to subject themselves to the government of the church "shall publickly own the covenant," and two forms were prepared, one "to be used in the admission of members unto state of education" and the other "in admission of members into full communion." [65] In the first months over a hundred persons owned the covenant of half-way holiness, and for several years the records show that Stoddard dutifully kept a double-entry ledger.[66] Then suddenly, in 1677, without warning, without asking anyone's permission, least of all Increase Mather's, taking full advantage of the autonomy of a Congregational Church and his isolation on the frontier, Stoddard abruptly ceased to keep a separate record of baptisms; thereafter he would baptise every adult that would assent to the creed, and all their children, and would treat everyone as a full member to be admitted to the communion as soon as possible. He gave up distinguishing between the covenants, and henceforth baptised not merely the children of members, but all the children in town; he took into the communion not merely the professing adults, but all adults. At one fell swoop he cured the evils of the Half-Way Covenant by going beyond it; he uprooted the New England Way in Northampton, and identified the visible church no longer with the communion of the saints, but with the town meeting — where he himself was dictator and lawgiver. There is evidence that he did not at first carry all the people with him, and great as was his authority, their turbulence was such that for a time he "knew not what to do with them. . . . The heat of spirit was raised to such a degree, that it came to hard blows," but "Pope" Stoddard forced his will upon them, and in his last years they were with him to a man.[67]

Stoddard wrought his revolution within the limits of Northampton, but the news travelled fast. One can imagine the consternation it produced along the seaboard, and especially

[64] Trumbull, History of Northampton, I, 215–17.

[65] Ibid., I, 213–14.

[66] Ibid., I, 214; II, 54.

[67] Sereno E. Dwight, The Life of President Edwards, New York, 1830, p. 463.

in the bosom of Increase Mather, who had just performed the hazardous feat of transforming himself from an angel of opposition to an angel of light and had staked his chances for the primacy of New England upon the success of the Half-Way Covenant. If Stoddard's notion should be taken up, the very ground would be pulled from under Mather's feet. At once he went before the General Court, naming no names but pointing his insinuation unmistakably, and declared that we must not bring into the sanctuary persons who will pollute it: "Yet I wish there be not Teachers found in our Israel, that have espoused loose, Large Principles here, Designing to bring all Persons to the Lords Supper, who have an historical Faith, and are not Scandalous in Life, altho' they never had Experience of a work of Regeneration." This, he told the representatives, "would corrupt Churches and ruin all in a little time." [68] Then he played what he believed was his trump card: "we know what our Fathers have Taught concerning that matter." Increase Mather was certain that Stoddard could be automatically discredited as soon as the people were made aware how much he betrayed the principles of the founders, "which they did with much cost and pains, dig out of the Rich veins of the Scripture." [69] To Mather, as to all Bostonians, it was inconceivable that anyone should persist in a course of conduct which his ancestors had disapproved.

When Stoddard came to the Synod of 1679, he found an infuriated Increase, and he thereupon offered to debate the question. Urian Oakes was appointed moderator; he was a wise man, and when the debate threatened, as it did very soon, to get hot, Oakes managed to have it deferred "& at present It was Eased." [70] Stoddard was put on the committee to revise the Confession of Faith, though Increase Mather did most of the writing; Mather inserted an explicit statement that persons must offer a relation of the work of the spirit before coming to the communion, but the committee altered it to read that they should make "a personal and publick profession of their Faith

[68] Increase Mather, A Discourse Concerning the Danger of Apostacy (delivered May 23, 1677; 1st ed., 1679), 2nd ed., 1685, pp. 116–17. [69] Ibid., pp. 116, 118.

[70] Williston Walker, The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, pp. 418–19.

and Repentance." [71] These were "weasel words" that could be taken either way; to Mather they would mean profession of an authentic conversion, but to Stoddard merely owning the covenant. In approving the revision, Stoddard later wrote, "I voted with the Rest, and am of the same judgment still." [72] He went back to Northampton and continued his work, as Increase Mather was saddened to learn in letters from his scouts, for example from John Russell of Hadley in 1681: "Our good Brother Stoddard hath bin strenuously promoting his position concerning that right which persons sound in doctrine of faith, & of (as he calls it) a holy Conversation, haue to full Communion." Russell added what must have been gall and wormwood to Increase Mather, that those who had supported the Synod of 1662 had now better begin to defend the communion from pollution by the unprepared; Russell did "every day sorrowfully increase in satisfaction" that the Half-Way Covenant "doth tend in the end of the worke (how good soever the end of the workers was) to shake & undermine the fundamentall doctrine & practise of the Congregationall way, viz., that visible Saints are only matter of a ch[urch] of Ch[ris]t." Increase having made himself the arch-apologist for that doctrine, Russell informed him, "I take the great care of that matter . . . to be upon your selfe." [73]

However, when Oakes so promptly shut off the public dispute in 1679, both Stoddard and Mather made a discovery: the New England Way could not stand further controversy. The churches were in enough turmoil over the Half-Way Covenant, and another fight would split them wide open. For Stoddard

[71] The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism, pp. 419, 433.

[72] Stoddard, An Appeal to the Learned, Boston, 1709, pp. 93–94. For Stoddard the issue was whether "persons should make a Relation of the work of Gods Spirit upon their hearts, in order to coming into full Communion," or "Whether those Professors of Religion as are of good Conversation, are not to be admitted. . . . Mr. *Mather* held the Negative; I laboured to make good the Affirmative." Partisans of Increase Mather were later assured by him that Stoddard's account of "the blotting out" of this clause was grossly mistaken, and they asked how Stoddard, after voting with the Synod, could compound with his conscience, since the Synod clearly meant that a work of grace should be examined before the admission (An Appeal, Of some of the Unlearned [1709], p. 17).

[73] MHS Coll., Ser. IV, Vol. 8, pp. 83–84.

this happy discovery was a strategic advantage: if he went about his business quietly, and devoted himself to persuading the churches of the valley to follow him, but at the same time refused to enter into open controversy, the Mathers were helpless. They did not dare assault him because they did not dare to break the peace. Consequently, for twenty years the writings of the Mathers, and of other Boston ministers, were full of veiled references that came near to open denunciation but never ventured into explicit attack. It has not been generally appreciated that the Magnalia is full of this material, and the book cannot be adequately understood except as being in great part directed against the man in Northampton. The chapter on Jonathan Mitchell, for instance, had to confront the issue, since Mitchell had been the chief architect of the Half-Way Covenant; Increase wrote a preface for his son's account and this segment was rushed into print in 1697, four years ahead of the volume.[74] Increase conceded everything possible: unjustifiable severity should not be used in imposing standards for admission; candidates should not be required to name the exact time and manner of their conversion, "such especially as have been advantaged with a religious education"; but, he insisted, the other extreme of laxity is utterly damnable. "Churches are bound in duty to enquire, not only into the *knowledge* and *orthodoxy*, but into the spiritual estate of those whom they receive into full communion." He could not call Stoddard by name, but he could say, "above all, their notion is to be rejected, as a church-corrupting principle, who assert that the sacrament is a converting ordinance," for if it were, "then the most scandalous persons in the world — yea, *heathen* people - - ought to have it administered unto them." To adopt this view, he once more asserted, "would be a *real apostacy* from the former principles, and a *degeneracy* from the *reformation* which we had attained unto," [75] and Cotton filled the narrative with quotations to prove that Mitchell had condemned Stoddard's idea, exactly as in the other biographies Cotton never lost a chance to show that all the patriarchs of New England were fully recorded

[74] Ecclesiastes, Boston, 1697.

[75] Magnalia, II, 67–79.

against it.[76] Many of Cotton's publications in the 1690's fairly boil with a suppressed fury that was the more incensed because it could not be expended publicly upon his adversary. He would denounce the heresy and say, "I care not whom it exasperates"; he would cry out that once we forego the "old Protestant" opinion of a prerequisite regeneration, "we may without a meer *Fancy*, overhear the dolefull, woful shout, which was audibly sounded from Heaven to *Rome*, when the *Church Doors* began to grow as wide as *Hell Gates* themselves." He would admit there are difficulties in attaining assurance, but still it is "a thing *Attainable*, *Profitable*, *Necessary*." [77] Older men, even in the Connecticut valley, sorrowed to see the apostasy spread, and Edward Taylor at Westfield confided to his papers an elegy on the death of Samuel Hooker in 1697, lamenting that when such champions are removed, then

> Apostasy wherewith thou art thus driven
> Vnto ye tents of Presbyterianism
> (Which is refined Prelacy at best)
> Will not stay long here in her tents, & rest,
> But o're this Bridge will carry thee apace
> Into ye Realms of Prelates arch, ye place
> Where open Sinners vile vnmasked indeed
> Are welcom Guests (if they can say ye Creed)
> Vnto Christs Table.[78]

But still Stoddard would give them no opening. He skirted the subject in The Safety of Appearing, picking his words carefully, saying that the Supper was designed "for strengthening of Faith," that "The *Devil* has a great hand in it, to keep them from that which is the means of help," that God does not require a faith of absolute assurance, because the ordinance "is a

[76] Cf. especially the life of Eliot, ibid., I, 554; also II, 244–47; II, 656: "Where a mighty body of people in a country are violently set upon running down the ancient *church state* in that country, and are violent for the hedge about the *communion* at the *Lord's Table* to be broken down . . . the Churches there are not far from a tremendous convulsion," etc., etc.

[77] Cotton Mather, Companion for Communicants, pp. 54–55, 87 and passim; cf; Blessed Unions, 1692, pp. 59–60; Things for a Distress'd People, 1696, pp. 17–18. Thirty Important Cases, 1699, pp. 8–12; Increase Mather, David Serving his Generation, 1698, p. 22; The Surest Way to the Greatest Honour, 1699, pp. 9–10.

[78] Taylor MS. (as transcribed by Mr. Thomas H. Johnson, through whose courtesy I am allowed to use the quotation).

special help to those that are in the dark." However, he qualified these remarks with, "It must be granted that to partake of it without faith is a sin, and so deserves damnation," [79] and thus he presented no clear target to the wrath of the Mathers. They were reduced again to fuming impotently at those nameless wretches "that plead for more *promiscuous Admissions* to the Lords Table." [80] When Stoddard came to Boston in 1693 Cotton told him to his face that if his doctrine "*came abroad, we would as Publickly animadvert upon it.*" [81] Stoddard bided his time.

By 1700 he was secure. The towns of the valley were falling into line behind him; only three, Belchertown, Pelham and Enfield, finally resisted him. The time had come for a test of strength, and Stoddard prepared a manuscript which he sent to publishers both in Boston and in London. Increase rushed into print before Stoddard's book appeared, and, as Cotton put it, "anticipated it, with an Answer." [82] Stoddard's was entitled, The Doctrine of Instituted Churches Explained and Proved from the Word of God, Mather's The Order of the Gospel. For ten years the battle raged, pamphlets were published, ministers harped upon it and the godly were grieved.[83]

[79] The Safety of Appearing, p. 285.

[80] Cotton Mather, A Companion for Communicants, pp. 42–43.

[81] Increase and Cotton Mather, "A Defence of Evangelical Churches" in John Quick, The Young Man's Claim unto the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Boston, 1700, p. 22.

[82] Ibid., p. 22.

[83] The principal titles in the controversy are:

Increase Mather, The Order of the Gospel, Boston, 1700.

Stoddard, The Doctrine of Instituted Churches, Boston, 1700; London, 1700.

John Quick, The Young Man's Claim unto the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (1st ed., London, 1691), 2nd ed., Boston, 1700, with preface, "A Defence of Evangelical Churches," by Increase and Cotton Mather, pp. 1–59.

Thomas Doolittle, A Treatise Concerning the Lords Supper, 19th ed., Boston, 1700.

John Higginson and William Hubbard, A Testimony to the Order of the Gospel In the Churches of New-England, Boston, 1701.

Stoddard, The Way for a People to Live Long in the Land that God Hath given them, Boston, 1703.

Stoddard, The Inexcusableness of Neglecting the Worship of God, under A Pretence of being in an Unconverted Condition, Boston, 1708.

Increase Mather, A Dissertation, wherein The Strange Doctrine Lately Pub-

Immediately after the volumes appeared, on July 4, 1700, at "a very great Assembly of Ministers" in Boston, Increase denounced Stoddard in his presence, and Cotton made one of the more impassioned utterances of his over-passionate life. "Among all the *Attempts* against the *State* of our Churches," Cotton declaimed, "I know none more open, more daring or more explicit"; he harangued the ministers, "I beseech you, Syrs, what you would be at! Your Attempts only furnish a profane Generation of People in the Countrey, with *Cavils* against the *Churches*. . . . You cannot rationally imagine to attain any *further Ends*, but only to *throw all into Confusion* and Contention," and he concluded by promising that the vengeance of God would overtake Solomon Stoddard. He offered to debate

---

lished in a Sermon, The Tendency of which, is, to *Encourage Unsanctified Persons* (while such) to Approach the Holy Table of the Lord, is *Examined* and *Confuted*, Boston, 1708.

Increase Mather, "An Advertisement Directed to the Communicants in the Churches of New-England," in the 20th ed. of Doolittle, A Treatise, Boston, 1708.

Stoddard, An Appeal to the Learned. Being a Vindication of the Right of Visible Saints to the Lords Supper, Though they be destitute of a Saving Work of God's Spirit on their Hearts, Boston, 1709.

An Appeal, Of some of the Unlearned, both to the Learned and Unlearned [Boston, 1709].

Cf. also Cotton Mather, American Tears upon the Ruines of the Greek Churches, 1701, pp. 47–55; Increase Mather, Ichabod, 1702, pp. 40, 78–79; Cotton Mather, Maschil, 1702, pp. 92–95; Jonathan Russell, A Plea for the Righteousness of God, 1704, p. 21; Samuel Mather, The Self-Justiciary Convicted and Condemned, 1707, pp. 14–19, Appendix; Cotton Mather, Temple Opening, 1709, pp. 11–16.

Stoddard added fuel to the flames in 1707 by coming out in favor of Governor Dudley at the time of the Vetch affair, when the Mathers were fighting him. Though Increase never surrendered (cf. Elijah's Mantle, 1722, p. 15), the controversy died down after 1710, with each champion holding his own district, and in 1714 Increase was ready to write a preface for Stoddard's Guide to Christ, saying, "It is known, that in some Points (not Fundamentals in Religion) I differ from this beloved Author; Nevertheless (as when there was a difference of Opinion between *Jerom* and *Austin*) Jerom said for all that, *I cannot but love Christ in Austin*; so do I say concerning my Brother *Stoddard*" (p. viii). Significantly enough, in 1721, when Increase was fighting for inoculation, he took special care that his two principal opponents in New England should be mobilized on his side: "Also we hear that the Reverend and Learned Mr. *Solomon Stoddard of Northampton* concurs with us; so doth the Reverend Mr. *Wise of Ipswich*" (Several Reasons Proving that Inoculation or Transplanting the *Small Pox*, is a Lawful Practice, 1721).

the issue at any place and time Stoddard would meet him, and Stoddard drove him into paroxysms of rage by disdaining even to reply.[84] Cotton Mather thereupon rode over to Salem and Ipswich to get Higginson and Hubbard, the two oldest ministers in the colony, to issue a testimony that Stoddard's notion was nothing like what the founders had instituted.[85] Stoddard was invited to deliver the election sermon in 1703; he calmly remarked in passing:

> Many men have bad Principles respecting the Worship of God: some allow too much to the authority of men: and some allow too much to the judgments of men; as if they were in their Nonage or Dotage, that they don't know to chuse the good and refuse the evil . . . there are many ways whereby persons come to be ill Principled . . . some by being too tenacious of old Traditions.[86]

Stoddard's arguments were based upon a simple proposition, that despite the founders of New England, true regeneration could not be proved in this life. From this premise flowed his two revolutionary conclusions: first, that the sacraments, both baptism and the Supper, were not designed merely to increase faith in those who already had it — since no one could tell who did — but to be "converting" ordinances for all men; second, that no such thing as a church covenant existed in the Bible and the whole ecclesiastical doctrine was a myth. The Mathers, on the other hand, were maintaining with all their might that the Lord's Supper "is appointed not for the Conversion of Sinners, but for the strengthning of Believers, not that for they who have no Grace might have Grace begun in them, but that they who have Grace might have more Grace conveyed into their Hearts," [87] and that particular churches could be founded only upon a free convenant of those who were the proved recipients of grace. Whatever the confusions and contradictions of the Half-Way Covenant, they would die before they would admit that New England had been wrong or that regeneration was not a definite experience to be certified by cross-examination.

[84] Diary, MHS Coll., Ser. VII, Vol. 7, 384–88. [85] Ibid., 363–64, 393–94.

[86] Stoddard, The Way for a People to Live Long in the Land that God Hath given them, pp. 24–25.

[87] Increase Mather, Practical Truths, 1704, p. 74.

Stoddard was a realist. He perceived that the Half-Way Covenant had in fact, even though not in theory, sundered the outward covenant of the church from the inward Covenant of Grace, and he proposed to separate them entirely, as both the Synod of 1662 and Increase Mather shrank from doing. The covenant which God makes with a "visible" people has nothing to do with the covenant of salvation; it binds merely to external observance, nor does it require special assistance. "The Visible People of God have a natural power to attend those duties"; regenerate and unregenerate can both take part in outward actions, and "if Sanctifying Grace were necessary in order to the lawfull attending of them, then it would be out of their power." [88] Increase Mather was maintaining that the unregenerate could not enter into any covenant with God: "This is a great mistake, tho' Unregenerate men are not in the internal, they have not performed any act of Saving Faith, . . . yet they are in the external Covenant." To them God makes certain promises "upon conditions of Obedience, and they promise Obedience unto him." [89] Even hypocrites, though no doubt going finally to Hell, are in the external covenant because they are useful in the church: "they are Serviceable by their gifts, by their authority, by their prudence & zeal, by their Estates; and it would be exceeding difficult for the Church to subsist without them." [90] The church is concerned only whether men be orthodox in their belief: "Churches are to judge concerning visible Saint-ship, when they go higher they go beyond their Sphere," [91] because, as Stoddard repeated throughout the controversy, "the Church is to act upon what is visible." [92] The inner church might take care of itself, the church of Northampton was visible and external, and it was the whole town.

The result, according to Stoddard, was a redefinition of the "visible" saint, which to him meant just that and nothing more: "Visible Saintship and real Saintship, may consist with a great deal of iniquity in the Conversation for a time." [93] A

[88] Stoddard, The Inexcusableness of Neglecting the Worship of God, pp. 17–18.
[89] Stoddard, An Appeal to the Learned, pp. 20–21.
[90] Ibid., pp. 18–19.
[91] Ibid., p. 76.
[92] Ibid., p. 73.
[93] The Doctrine of Instituted Churches, p. 6.

man is a visible saint, and a church member if he can say "yes" when the minister recites the creed to him. And all such, however destitute of saving faith, should come to the sacraments in the effort to cure their iniquity; they do not need sanctifying grace, which is indeed, said Stoddard, "an inestimable blessing" and necessary to salvation, but it "is not necessary unto the Lawfull attending of any duty of Worship." [94] Mather and all apologists for the Half-Way Covenant admitted that the churches made mistakes, that not all those they received into the covenant turned out well; then, said Stoddard, Mather is content with a "probable hope" rather than absolute assurance, and "then such persons may come as are not sincere, and then Sanctifying grace is not necessary in order to a lawful attending the Lords Supper." [95] On this argument Stoddard worked out one of his most ingenious conclusions, that since visible Christianity does not consist in true faith, the act of "owning" the covenant does not imply a real compliance with the Gospel and can be performed by those who really in their hearts reject Christ! "When such profess faith, they make a true Profession, they profess that which they do indeed believe, though their profession be not graciously sincere, & men are bound to speak the truth, though they only do it with a moral, and not with a gracious sincerity." [96] Such men should not be debarred from the sacrament, and they who do not know enough about the creed to qualify as visible Christians "may soon be sufficiently informed." [97] "It is unreasonable to believe Men to be visible Saints from their Infancy till they be forty or fifty years of Age, and yet not capable of coming to the Lords Supper, for want of the Exercise of Faith." [98] It is much better, and also more in accord with Biblical example, to baptise all who will be baptised, and send them as soon as possible to the Supper in the hope they may get some good from it. This ordinance is not,

[94] The Inexcusableness of Neglecting the Worship of God, p. 3.

[95] An Appeal to the Learned, p. 9.

[96] Ibid., p. 45; cf. Samuel Hopkins' comment, 1765: "So that they who really reject Jesus Christ, and dislike the gospel way of salvation in their hearts, and know that this is true of themselves, may make the profession without lying and hypocrisy" (Trumbull, History of Northampton, II, 55).

[97] Doctrine of Instituted Churches, p. 19.

[98] Ibid., p. 20.

and cannot, be designed only to strengthen faith in those who already have it; it is dispensed to "visible" saints, whether they have real faith or no. The end of the communion is the conversion of sinners; the ordinance has a tendency to draw them to Christ,[99] and "All Ordinances are for the Saving good of those that they are to be administred unto." [100] Hence, the visible world being what it is, nothing at all synonymous with the invisible, the Supper would have to be intended for conversion, not merely for confirmation. Stoddard did not doubt that the way of salvation is narrow and that sincere repentance is necessary, but the sacraments should be a help not a hindrance. He was "well assured, they are the Ordinances and path of Life, in which every Christian ought to walk; and I dare not my self, as one of the Stewards in Gods House, refuse his Bread to such as regularly demand it." [101]

Stoddard's arguments were revolutionary because they appealed not only to logic but to practical experience; he was ready to accept the arbitration of fact in a utilitarian and pragmatic spirit that had not hitherto been prominent among the Puritan clergy. He saw his reform as the inevitable conclusion to the Half-Way Covenant.[102] The Synod had said that the children are in covenant with God, and therefore the seal belongs to them; very well, asked Stoddard, in what covenant? The Covenant of Grace? Experience had proved that assumption false in numberless instances. But they were indeed in a covenant, the outward, visible covenant of the church, and when they came of age they were to receive the outward, visible sacrament in the hope it would convert them. If men were put upon the rack which the Mathers had devised, forced to come to the sacrament and threatened with damnation if they came unworthily, then "Sacrament Days which should be Days of Comfort, will become Days of Torment." [103] By Mather's logic the hopeful man, the sincere Christian who is not yet certain of his calling, "is charged to come because of his hopes, and condemned for coming because he is unsanctified." [104] Such

[99] Doctrine of Instituted Churches, p. 22.
[100] An Appeal to the Learned, p. 25.
[101] Ibid., p. 96.
[102] Ibid., pp. 90–91.
[103] Doctrine of Instituted Churches, p. 22.
[104] An Appeal to the Learned, p. 63.

teaching has a direct tendency to discourage men. Forty years ago, Stoddard recollected, there were a multitude of unbaptised, and that neglect was remedied by the Half-Way Covenant, but now there is another problem: "to this day there be Four to One that do neglect the Lords-Supper; as if it did not belong to them to magnify God." [105] And what wonder, when people were taught by the Mathers? "It is a poor thing for men to be scared into Religion, but it is sad indeed for men to be scared out of Religion, & to neglect Gods Worship out of fear of God." [106] These were, by universal admission, "degenerate times," and Stoddard was certain that the clergy were not helping matters by excluding the greater part of the moral citizens. "Staying from Ordinances is not the way to fit men for Ordinances: the neglecting of the Sacrament is the way to make the Country grow prophane." [107] The Mathers accused him of formalism, of sacrificing true religion for the externality of a visible organization; Stoddard replied that limitation of the communion "has a tendency to nourish carnal confidence in them that are admitted, and to nourish Prophaneness in them that are excluded." If there were evils in his system, the evils of the traditional one were worse, because by telling the people that they must be converted before coming to the sacrament it persuaded them "that they are Converted before they are." The Mathers "are zealous against coming to the Lords-Supper in an Unconverted condition, yet advise & incourage such persons to come under a notion that they are Converted." Thus the bold are flattered "as if the bitterness of death were past," the truly conscientious are frightened, and the carefree multitude go unhindered to perdition.[108]

If there was no way of telling who were the true saints, and if everybody in town who paid his bills, raised a family and kept out of trouble was a visible saint, there obviously was no sense in the church covenant. Stoddard argued in part from the Bible, declaring, "There is no Syllable in the Word of God, intimating any such thing," but he immediately added the

[105] The Inexcusableness of Neglecting the Worship of God, p. 26.
[106] Ibid., p. 18.
[107] Ibid., p. 19.
[108] Ibid., pp. 20–22.

more compelling reason, "neither is there any need of it." [109] The consent of visible saints cannot create a church, for their covenant "is no other, then what all Christians do make, when they make a profession of Faith and Obedience." Congregational theory had held that a free Christian people could be bound together only by their own consent, but according to Stoddard, "there is some what else that binds a free People in the same Town to mutuall subjection, to the Government of the Town," which is the law of the land and the law of God.[110] The church is founded on the command of an arbitrary God, not on a rational compact.

> If a Christian live in a Town, where there is a Church, he is immediately bound to joyn with that Church; and that Church is bound to him to govern him . . . but there is no occasion that every Member should Covenant particularly with the Church. . . . This Doctrine of the particular Covenant is wholly unscriptural, is the reason that many among us are shut out of the Church, to whom Church Priviledges do belong.[111]

The last sentence explains all the rest. Stoddard was arguing facts not theories. Seventy years of New England had proved that men, even ostensibly holy men, were not upright enough, responsible or energetic enough, to maintain democratic societies. There was not enough difference between saints and sinners to build upon, at least in this world. If Stoddard's argument prevails, cried Cotton Mather, then "all the Ungodliest Wretches that call themselves *Christians*, in the Town, are *Church Members*, even, whether they will, or no." [112] Precisely, agreed Stoddard. The important thing was that they call themselves Christians (Stoddard had no intention of taking in the Indians!). He lived on the frontier, among blacksmiths, Yankee farmers and Indian fighters, and he saw that the neglect of "good Government of all Gods people, born within the Pale of the Church" was bringing "these Churches to a great defection." The remedy was not to preach more metaphysics, it was "not to deny them their right at the Lords Table, but to give

[109] Doctrine of Instituted Churches, p. 8.

[110] Ibid., pp. 7–8; Appeal to the Learned, pp. 69–70.

[111] Doctrine of Instituted Churches, p. 8.

[112] Increase and Cotton Mather, "Defence of Evangelical Churches," in Quick, The Young Man's Claim, p. 37.

them that, and a good and strict Watch over their Lives and Manners, together with it." [113]

How confusing to apply to the past the labels of the present! Here were the Mathers, the Boston conservatives, defending what was left of democracy in the New England system, while the frontier radical, Solomon Stoddard, was openly advocating autocracy. Frontier individualism, common-sense and contempt for tradition resulted in benevolent despotism, while loyalty to the past and sophistical speculation in Boston resulted in a defense of personal freedom and the liberty of the covenant. Stoddard was quite explicit. Within the church, which was founded not on consent but on geographical unity and the fiat of law, "the Elders are to Rule over the Church, and therefore not to be over-ruled by the Brethren." [114] The pastor should determine who would be admitted or excommunicated, not the congregation. "It is not the work either of the Brethren or Ruling elders, any ways to intermeddle in that Affair or Limit him," [115] for, as he frankly put it, "*The community are not fit to judge & rule in the Church.*" Matters of administration require wisdom, "but the Community are not men of understanding"; many of them "have not had the advantage of Reading & Study. Some of them are Men of very weak Abilities, some of them are rash, some of them are Young, hardly Sixteen Years of Age, some of them are Servants." Christ surely did not intrust the government of His church to men so "uncapable." [116] For these reasons, openly avowed, Stoddard advocated autocracy within each church and an autocratic, centralized control of all societies. If there be no "National Church," he said, "then every particular Congregation is absolute and independent, and not responsable to any higher Power," which seemed to him shocking.[117] Even the last shred of liberty he would take from the people and would give to synods the power "to oversee the calling of Persons to

[113] An Appeal to the Learned, p. 98.

[114] Doctrine of Instituted Churches, p. 12.

[115] Ibid., p. 12.

[116] "An Examination of the Power of the Fraternity," Appendix to The Presence of Christ with the Ministers of the Gospel, Boston, 1718, pp. 10–11.

[117] Doctrine of Instituted Churches, pp. 25–27.

the Ministry, and to appoint those who shall examine them." The local autocrats should meet in a synod of autocrats and see to it "that Churches Act regularly, and that none should be set in the Ministry but such as are duely qualified." [118] Stoddard's teaching bore fruit in Connecticut with the Saybrook Platform, and Congregationalism there approximated a "Presbyterian" polity.

One cannot help feeling a mixture of both admiration and pity at the efforts of the Mathers to meet this onslaught. They stoutly clung to what was left of the original idealism in the New England Way; though they had surrendered much in the Half-Way Covenant, they would not yield the essential position, that churches must be made up of men who at least *seem* regenerate and must be founded upon consent. They argued that the sacraments were not converting ordinances but seals to the covenant, to be properly given only to those previously sanctified. "The Lord has joyned the Exhibiting Sign, and the Grace Exhibited thereby, together." This was their persuasion and this was the corner-stone of New England: they would not administer the sacraments to any "to whom we cannot in charitable Judgment say, 'You are in Covenant with God.'" [119] They recognized that it was difficult to reach an infallible assurance, but they still believed that "He that has in him the *Grace* of God may come to *know* that he has it. The *Grace* of God is a *discernible* thing." [120] Only such a justifying faith gave access to the sacrament in the sight of God; the visibility that gave title before men was to be as closely identified with the other as possible, and though some hypocrites might deceive the ministers, their responsibility for keeping the church pure and holy was not thereby lessened. The Mathers were true Puritans; they were fighting for what was right in spite of what was fact; they would not basely surrender to difficulties, but would attempt to subdue them in the name of an absolute and *a priori* truth.

Partisans of democracy in America should also set it down

[118] Doctrine of Instituted Churches, p. 34.

[119] Increase Mather, Dissertation, pp. 28–29.

[120] Cotton Mather, Meat out of the Eater, 1703, p. 43.

to the eternal glory of the Mathers that they fought Stoddard's autocratic scheme and kept it out of eastern New England. In his speech of July 4, 1700, Cotton Mather delivered himself of sentiments prophetic of the spirit of seventy-six years later:

> The *Liberty* of the *Fraternity*, in things of common Concernment; for the Fraternity to be Governed, not as meer *Bruits* or *Mutes*. . . . Our Gentlemen do assay utterly to take away all manner of *Liberty*, from the *Brethren* in our *Churches*. Because it may be, in some Churches things may have been sometimes carried in a Strain too *democratical* . . . they can't speak of the *People*, in other Terms, than the *Pharisees* did of old. . . . A goodly *Reformation!* Syrs, tis unintelligible, tis unaccountable.[121]

But before we give way to unqualified admiration of these noble sentiments, we must remember that the Mathers were in an untenable position. Their attacks on Stoddard's sacramental theory rang hollow when they themselves had to acknowledge how sadly out of kilter the New England system had become, when they too confessed that conversions were dwindling, when they had advocated the deadening compromise of the Half-Way Covenant, and when they had no solution whatsoever for the tormenting dilemma of the Lord's Supper. The weight of tradition was with them, but the weight of fact was against them. And as for Stoddard's autocracy, the Mathers were no democrats; Increase was just then striving to prove that Congregationalists and Presbyterians could harmonize their systems, and he and Cotton were pushing the movement for associations that resulted in the infamous *Proposals* of 1705. As between Stoddard and John Wise, the Mathers were closer to Stoddard, though their devotion to the past prevented their going the whole way. And so, when they argued with him, instead of resting their case solidly upon the spiritual idealism of the Congregational vision, they filled up their pages by denouncing him as a Papist and a traitor. Their chief stock-in-trade was a monotonous song of ancestor worship, and they could imagine no more damaging accusation than "innovation." We must "*abide in those Truths respecting the Order of the Gospel, which our Fathers have left us as a Legacy*," and for any man to become an instrument of "Discomposing"

[121] Diary, MHS Coll., Ser. VII, Vol. 7, 385–86.

this order, "it were better to *Dy*, than come under that *unhappiness*." [122]

They little comprehended their man. The founders of New England, Stoddard preached in Boston, "were a very holy People that came into this Land, whatever mistakes they were under, in any particulars, their hearts were engaged to do the Will of God," [123] but "it lyes upon us to consider whether we have not corrupted ourselves." He introduced an entirely new note into American religious discussion, one that had not been heard on these shores since the settlement: "The mistakes of one Generation many times become the calamity of succeeding Generations." [124] At Stoddard's funeral, William Williams said that "he us'd a freedom in examining of things and confined himself not to the opinion of others"; [125] when Increase Mather told him that he had deserted the principles of the founders, he replied in words that must be quoted at length, for they make one of the great passages in American colonial literature:

> As the renown of those Reformers is a bulwark against those Errors that were Exploded by them, so we find our selves embarrassed by their mistakes from proceeding in the work of Reformation: As if it were criminal not to mistake with them. . . .
>
> Men are wont to make a great noise, that we are bringing in of Innovations, and depart from the Old Way: But it is beyond me to find out wherein the iniquity does lye. We may see cause to alter some practices of our Fathers, without despising of them, without priding our selves in our own Wisdom, without Apostacy, without abusing the advantages that God has given us, without a spirit of compliance with corrupt men, without inclinations to Superstition, without making disturbances in the Church of God: And there is no reason that it should be turned as a reproach upon us.
>
> Surely it is commendable for us to Examine the practises of our Fathers; we have no sufficient reason to take practises upon trust from them: let them have as high a character as belong to them, yet we may not look upon their principles as Oracles . . . it would be no humility, but baseness of spirit, for us to judge our selves uncapable, to Examine the principles that have been handed down to us: If we be any ways fit to open the Mysteries of the Gospel,

[122] Increase Mather, Ichabod, 1702, pp. 86–87; Cotton Mather, A Pillar of Gratitude, 1700, p. 26; the Mathers so overdid the denunciation that an election preacher in 1705 protested against those who brand such as differ from them "with the ill Titles of Apostates, and Subverters of the Order of the Gospel" (Joseph Easterbrook, Abraham the Passenger, 1705, p. 19).

[123] Stoddard, The Danger of Speedy Degeneracy, Boston, 1705, p. 15.

[124] Stoddard, Examination of the Power, pp. 1–2.

[125] William Williams, The Death of a Prophet Lamented, Boston, 1729, p. 24.

we are capable to judge of these matters: And it would ill become us so to indulge our selves in ease, as to neglect the Examination of received principles. If the practises of our Fathers in any particulars were mistakes, it is fit they should be rejected, if they be not, they will bear Examination: If we be forbidden to Examine their practises, that will cut off all hopes of Reformation.[126]

William Ellery Channing could not have been more precise, Emerson more self-reliant, or Theodore Parker more resolute! Hence, when Increase Mather indulged in eloquent hymns to the founders, saying that never did a generation so achieve perfection, Stoddard sourly replied that he magnified his ancestors into the Twelve Apostles, and said this "especially is his proper Element." [127] When Increase moaned, "Would he bring the Churches in *New-England* back to the Imperfect Reformation in other Lands, and so deprive us of our Glory for ever?" [128] Stoddard remarked, "Mr. *Mather* all along intermingles Passionate Lamentations with his Arguments," which "serve to swell the Book and make it more in bulk, but not in weight." [129] Certain parishioners of the Mathers, no doubt prompted by Cotton, could express their horror only by advertising their reverence for the vast learning of Increase Mather and their contempt for the "very little Reading" of Solomon Stoddard; they said that they "of the Unlearned" did not think a thing true merely because there were authorities for it, but they did "not think it any Answer to an Argument, to flout at the Author for being *a Man of great Reading*." [130]

William Williams said that Stoddard, though a grave man, was of a delightful conversation, "accompanied with a very sweet Affability & a Freedom from Moroseness." [131] We may take this to mean that he had a sense of humor, and he probably never laughed more heartily than at the self-confessed "unlearned" of the North Church. He was secure enough in his own scholarship, but one of the most frequent themes in his preaching was a castigation of the ministers for being too

[126] The Inexcusableness of Neglecting the Worship of God, Preface.
[127] An Appeal to the Learned, A 2, recto.
[128] Increase Mather, Dissertation, p. 85.
[129] Stoddard, An Appeal to the Learned, A 2, verso.
[130] An Appeal, Of Some of the Unlearned, pp. 2–3.
[131] William Williams, Death of a Prophet, p. 24.

learned! For Increase Mather the problem was to keep the visible church in some degree conformed to an *a priori* pattern. If the society diverged from the pattern, the remedy was education, instruction, scholarship; if the theory was failing, it was the fault not of theory but of men, and men were to be cured by culture. He had said in 1677 that the interest of religion and good literature rose and fell together. Solomon Stoddard said, "Whatever Books Men have read, there is great need of *experimental* Knowledge in a Minister; many particular Things will occur that he will not meet withal in Books"; [132] while men may clear up many principles by learning, he said once more, learning is no security against error. "Learned Education will not deliver Men from carnal Reason. . . . Errors in Religion have been generally the Offspring of great Scholars." He was more interested that ministers have a work of God in their hearts than that they go to college. "Experience fits Men to teach others." [133]

The picture of Stoddard that emerges from these disputes is clear and unmistakable. The power of the man is sufficiently evident, I am sure, even from my quotations; still more importantly, he appears to our eyes as the herald of a new century and a new land, the eighteenth against the seventeenth, the West against the East. He was the first great "revivalist" in New England. As his son-in-law rightly said at his funeral, his chief contention always was "that the Essence and Life of Christianity lies not in *external Observations*, or formal Acts of Worship, but in our being made *Partakers of the Divine Nature*." [134] He announced in the preface to The Safety of Appearing — which he had to write himself! — that he made it a rule to gain souls and preach upon the things that reach the

[132] Guide to Christ (1st ed., 1714), 1735, Preface, p. 8.

[133] The Defects of Preachers Reproved (New London, 1724), 2nd ed., Boston, 1747, pp. 5–6. His opinion of Harvard was implied in his election sermon of 1703: "'tis not worth the while for persons to be sent to the *Colledge* to learn to Complement men, and Court Women; they should be sent thither to prepare them for Publick Service, and had need be under the over-sight of wise and honest men" (The Way for a People, p. 13).

[134] W. Williams, Death of a Prophet, p. 26; cf. Nash's Elegy;

> He fish'd for Souls, through Grace he many caught,
> Into his Net great draughts the Spirit brought, etc.

heart of religion, and not upon false doctrines.[135] His sermons were outstanding in his day for the decision with which he swept away the paraphernalia of theology and logic, to arouse men to becoming partakers of the divine nature, and he was the first minister in New England openly to advocate the preaching of Hell-fire and brimstone in order to frighten men into conversion. "If men be thoroughly scared with the danger of damnation, they will readily improve their possibility, and not stand for assurance of success." [136] His reforms in church polity came not from a lessened sense of the reality of conversion but from a heightened.[137] Even Increase Mather could divine that much, and he argued that Stoddard was led to abolish the public relation of faith because his own experience, having been of "such notable Operations of the Holy Spirit," set him a standard that was much too high. Did we measure all men by a Stoddard, "there will not be in a whole Town, *Regenerate* Persons enough, to make a *Church*," whereas by the milder criterion with which Mather was content, "a *Judgment of Charity* would find a considerable Number." [138] But though he could comprehend this much, Mather could never grasp Stoddard's great discovery. If true regeneration proved supremely difficult to ascertain, that fact for Mather and his followers became a defeat and a discouragement; by deliberately declaring that no one could know beyond the possibility of doubt, and then by bringing all men upon the same level of uncertainty before the Supper, Stoddard turned the defeat into victory. "Men dont know who are blessed," [139] but this "uncertainty of Election is no discouragement." [140] The effect

[135] The Safety of Appearing, pp. i–iv.

[136] Guide to Christ, p. 39; cf. The Presence of Christ with the Ministers of the Gospel, Boston, 1718, pp. 26–28; The Defects of Preachers Reproved, pp. 4–5.

[137] Cf. his A Treatise Concerning Conversion, Boston, 1719, for his analysis of regeneration as a cataclysmic and overwhelming experience.

[138] Increase Mather in Quick, Young Man's Claim, pp. 46–47; Stoddard apparently experienced a profound conversion "upon his Entrance into the Ministry; which Work was so *clearly carried on*, and made so *deep* an Impression upon his Spirit, that he always remembr'd it, and often spake of it" (Williams, Death of a Prophet, p. 25).

[139] Those Taught by God the Father, To Know God the Son, are Blessed, Boston, 1712, p. 17.

[140] Three Sermons Lately Preach'd at Boston, Boston, 1717, p. 30.

of his scepticism was to make regeneration all the more exciting, all the more to be sought after by more men than those who had inherited a promise of God through their forbears.

Stoddard's ringing declaration of independence is a stirring utterance, but we must remember that it was to lead not to a larger freedom for the laity but to less, not to carrying forward the democracy of Congregationalism but the autocracy. And furthermore, it marked a surrender of the idealism which had first inspired the clergy of New England to attempt the achievement of a holy society on the face of the earth. Stoddard was announcing a new era, free from the past and self-reliant; he was arguing from facts and not from theories, concerned with results and not with dogmas. But in so doing, he was concluding the chapter that had begun with the introduction of the Half-Way Covenant. Every historian has his own thesis as to when the "Middle Ages" came to an end and the "modern" epoch commenced. Of course the transition was slow and infinitely varied, but if we must settle upon a definite date for the shift in America, 1662 will serve as well as any. In committing themselves to the Half-Way Covenant, the Puritans lost the insight they had carried down from medieval Christianity. Then they slackened their faith in the unity of spirit and matter within the all-encompassing purpose of God, and first accepted a fatal dualism which let the two pursue separate courses. From the Harvard of Dunster to the Harvard of William James is a long journey, but half the distance was covered by the time of Increase Mather, for it had already become possible to talk about the varieties of religious experience instead of the one true and authentic knowledge of the spirit. In place of the sharp division of sanctity from sinfulness, the Synod instituted its hesitant shadings of professed but unreliable sainthood, partial but questionable regeneration, and presumable but unprovable reprobation. The Mathers acknowledged the existence of variety, but they tried to insist that nevertheless there was a single true experience. Solomon Stoddard accepted the varieties, gave up the effort to distinguish, and out of scepticism erected a new coherence, adapted to a frontier society and to reviving the spirits of all men. Just as John Locke gave over

the quest for certainty in the "ocean of being" in order to find out what the purely human understanding might know, so Stoddard abandoned the attempt to comprehend the whole purpose of God, defined Him as inscrutable will, and adapted his system to men's necessities. Out of an initial scepticism Locke constructed the age of reason; out of a scepticism concerning the identity of the saints, Stoddard inaugurated the era of revivalism on the American frontier. The price he paid for his success was a final and complete separation of the spirit and the flesh, of the kingdom of God and the town meeting. "All that are taught by the Father will make a Profession of Christ: but there be many that make that Profession, that are not taught by the Father. There is a great difference between the visible Church and the invisible." [141]

Stoddard's funeral was a memorable day in the Connecticut valley, and his son-in-law, William Williams, was fully conscious of the solemnity of the event as he delivered the oration. By his side sat a young man, tall as were all of the Stoddard blood, the grandson and successor of the "Pope." While you lament your loss, Williams told the town, you must also be mindful of the blessing you still have, "and I hope 'twill excite and maintain among you a *Spirit of Prayer* for his *Son* and *Successor*, that the *Spirit of Elijah* may rest upon him"; "that you will in all proper ways strengthen" him "under the weight of so much Work as is now rowl'd upon him." [142] The tempo of revival that Stoddard set in motion gathered momentum. Under Stoddard there had been "harvests" in 1679, 1683, 1696, 1712, 1718, and in each the "*bigger* Part of the *young* People in the Town, seemed to be mainly concerned for their eternal Salvation." [143] There was another in 1734, and then the tremendous upheaval of 1740. The young Elisha led them, and whipped them on, and for twenty years meditated upon his grandfather's dictum, "There is no infallible Sign of Grace, but Grace." [144] Scepticism in any form was not congenial to Jonathan Edwards.

[141] Stoddard, Those Taught by God, p. 18.

[142] Williams, Death of a Prophet, p. 28.

[143] Sibley, Biographical Sketches of Graduates of Harvard University, II, 113–14.

[144] The Defects of Preachers Reproved, p. 12.

His grandfather had freed him from the mechanical theology of the Covenant, had brought back freshness and vigor to religion, had taught him how to manage revivals and to bring souls to conversion. Was it true that there is no infallible sign of grace? The results of his meditations are known to history, and in 1751, after the people at Northampton had ceased to pray for Stoddard's successor and the work "rowl'd upon him," two years after they had cast him out and he was dwelling in the loneliness of the Stockbridge wilderness, Edwards wrote to Thomas Gillespie in Scotland that most moving of letters [145] in which he said that the people of Northampton were well instructed but "have grown a much greater and more wealthy people than formerly," in which he acknowledged that one thing which had brought about his tragic fall "was my youth, and want of more judgment and experience" at a time when there was needed not a youth, but "a giant, in judgment and discretion, among a people in such an extraordinary state of things," in which also he listed among the causes for his failure the still domineering personality of Solomon Stoddard:

> They have also had the great advantage of the vast veneration, the people had for Mr. Stoddard's memory; which was such, that many looked on him, almost as a sort of deity. They were all (i.e. except the young people,) born and brought up under his ministry, and had been used from their infancy to esteem his sayings all as oracles. And he, they knew, maintained that doctrine which I oppose, with great positiveness and zeal, and opposed the contrary, which I maintain, as an exceedingly pernicious doctrine. Under these circumstances, I naturally appear as a dangerous opposer of the cause of God, and my teaching and insisting on the doctrine, which Mr. Stoddard opposed, appears to them a sort of horrid profaneness.

[145] Sereno E. Dwight, Life of President Edwards, pp. 463–66.

SOUL GODS

THE article in the April, 1941 number of the REVIEW on The Epitaph of Julius Terentius by C. B. Welles, and the following Postscript by A. D. Nock, are of great interest for their presentation of Graeco-Roman thought on the state of departed souls. The writer would note some scanty correspondences from the Oriental field.

Parallel to the θεαὶ ψυχαί, 'soul gods,' is one reference in the Hebrew Bible, in the scene when the witch of Endor calls up the ghost of Samuel (1 Samuel 28: 8 ff.). "What seest thou?" inquires the anxious Saul. The response is: "I see a god (or *gods* with the Hebrew plural) coming up out of the earth," and from her description of the apparition Saul recognizes Samuel.

The newly discovered Ugaritic literature reveals a further aspect of very ancient Semitic thought on life after death, with illumination of Biblical passages. The following utterance occurs repeated in two of the Ugaritic dramatic poems:[1] "Go down *bṯḫpṯt*, to the earth; thou shalt be numbered among those who go down into the earth." The transliterated phrase occurs, interestingly enough, in 2 Kings 18: 5, where we learn how king Azariah/Uzziah "was smitten with leprosy unto the day of his death, and he dwelt *bĕbēt haḥopšīt*," i.e. 'in the house of (the) *ḥ*.' It is going too far afield to list the many various explanations of the enigmatic word by both Biblical and Ugaritic scholars. But the ancient interpretation, e.g. by Aquila and Rashi is correct; *ḥopšīt* = 'freedom.' Also otherwise Ugaritic *ḥpṯ* = Akkadian *ḫubšu* means, as a social term, 'freeman.' Accordingly the Biblical term means 'house (= state?) of exemption,' i.e. from royal duties; Azariah was disqualified by his leprosy. The same root-theme appears in Psalms 88: 6 (5), where the corresponding adjective, *ḥopšī* appears in the phrase 'free among the dead,' as the Anglican Prayer Book and the King James' Bible correctly translate, versus many recent translations. That lower world of the spirits is what Job longed for (5:17): "there the wicked cease from troubling, and there the weary are at rest." We recall that in the classical stories of descent into hell the wraiths crowd about Ulysses and Aeneas, for they having nothing to do, no cares, no duties!

The comparative paucity of reference to the other life in the Hebrew

[1] Virolleaud, 'Un nouveau chant du poème d'Aleïn-Baal,' Syria, 1932, 133 ff., col. viii, 7 ff., and 'La mort de Baal,' Syria, 1934, col. v, 14 ff. These texts are presented as Poems B, D, in Montgomery and Harris, The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts.

Bible is doubtless due to a self-imposed restraint of the religion against the fanciful myths that, as we now know, abounded in Syria and Palestine from ancient times. Two remarkable passages stand out in contrast with such mythological frivolities. The one case is Psalms 73: 25 f. (24 f.): "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward take me to glory [the last verb as in the translation of Enoch]. Whom have I in heaven (beside Thee), and there is none upon earth that I desire beside Thee" — a sudden uplift of the soul in a context dealing with this life. The other passage is the classical elevation of spirit in Job 19: 25 ff., which may only be cited in part because of the varieties of interpretation in view of the difficult text. "I know that my Champion liveth, and at the last He shall stand upon the earth. . . . Then without my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see on my side, and mine eyes shall behold Him, no stranger!" There follows the relapse from this ascent of the soul: "My reins are consumed within me!" In such transports the saint found his so personal and intimate God as guarantor of his immortality. And it is this personal relationship with the Deity that is the core of the Jewish and Christian belief.

J. A. Montgomery

University of Pennsylvania